

2016

Examining Perceptions of Black Administrators in Higher Education Regarding Administrative Leadership Opportunities

Renita Taylor Thompson
University of North Florida

Suggested Citation

Thompson, Renita Taylor, "Examining Perceptions of Black Administrators in Higher Education Regarding Administrative Leadership Opportunities" (2016). *UNF Graduate Theses and Dissertations*. 713.
<https://digitalcommons.unf.edu/etd/713>

This Doctoral Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Scholarship at UNF Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in UNF Graduate Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of UNF Digital Commons. For more information, please contact [Digital Projects](#).

© 2016 All Rights Reserved

Running head: EXAMINING PERCEPTIONS OF BLACK

Examining Perceptions of Black Administrators in Higher Education Regarding Administrative
Leadership Opportunities

By

Renita Taylor Thompson

A dissertation submitted to the
Department of Leadership, School Counseling, and Sports Management
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Educational Leadership

UNIVERSITY OF NORTH FLORIDA
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION AND HUMAN SERVICES

August, 2016

EXAMINING PERCEPTIONS OF BLACK

© Copyright by Renita Taylor Thompson 2016

All Rights Reserved

Certificate of Approval

DEDICATION

It is with great appreciation that I dedicate this dissertation to my husband, Bryan Thompson and our heartbeats, Kourtnee, Brenida, Taylor, and Bryce. Your love and support were the key ingredients to my success. I thank you, love you, and hope to make you proud.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

And let us not be weary in well doing: for in due season we shall reap, if we faint not.

(Galatians 6:9, King James Version).

It is only befitting that I give honor to God for providing me with the support of the best family, friends, and committee members a person could ever hope for throughout this process. For some unexplainable reason, all of the people surrounding me are the best at whatever role they play in my life. This mere attempt will not begin to express my gratitude for the unconditional love and support I have received from each of you. Kourtnee, Brenida, Taylor, and Bryce, you gave me the energy I needed to finish the race. Even when life seemed to get in the way, one look into your eyes would always put things into perspective for me. I kept moving forward because I knew four pairs of eyes were watching my every move; therefore, giving up was never an option. I encourage you to dream BIG and no matter what the circumstance, never give up. Thank you for understanding my unwavering desire to follow my dreams. I hope and pray that you are able to realize the value of persistence as there were many sacrifices that were made for me to reach the finish line.

To my soulmate and best friend Bryan, thank you for being the wind beneath my wings. I appreciate your prayers and encouragement that kept me afloat when I thought all hope was lost. You kept me focused and balanced during times of mental anguish and distress. I have no doubt in my mind that this would not be possible without you being who and what you are in my life. Your love, respect, and support were the key ingredients to my success.

EXAMINING PERCEPTIONS OF BLACK

Thanks to my sister and probably biggest cheerleader, Carmesha. I always knew you were watching from the sidelines ready to jump in to assist with whatever I may have needed. I am so grateful to have had you in my corner.

My passion for learning stems back to the way I was raised. My “Grammy”, Margaret was my very first teacher. I am grateful that you made me research things long before Google was the popular search engine it has become today. I appreciate you teaching me how to look things up in the encyclopedia and dictionary. Although I could not understand your rationale at the time, I would venture to say your strategy made a researcher out of me. I have you to thank for my passion for knowledge.

To my parents, Theo and Tracee, thank you for always making me feel like I could excel at anything I put my mind to. Your belief in me strengthened me and caused me to reach for the stars. Daddy, thanks for generously providing me with a new laptop when my computer crashed back in 2012. Although it too has since gone to “computer heaven”, many pages of this dissertation were written from your gift. Ma, thank you for the titling sessions. I appreciate the hours we spent brainstorming to come up with the perfect titles for each of the factors. Your gift of time was greatly appreciated.

I would like to thank my “ride-or-die” mother-in-law, Ida, who stepped in on several occasions to take up the slack whenever we needed her. Thank you for always being willing to help me reach my goals. I appreciate your unconditional love and dedication. I could not have made it if it had not been for your prayers and support.

Thank you to a host of family members and friends who lifted me up when I needed them the most. Stefany, Ted, Andria, Shayla, T3, and UNF COEHS Cohort 19, your love and

EXAMINING PERCEPTIONS OF BLACK

encouragement took me to higher heights during some of my most desperate times. I appreciate and love each of you.

To my dissertation committee, my sincere appreciation for guiding me through this process. Dr. Chris Janson, thank you for being my advisor and the chair of my committee. I know that there were times when my expectations were unrealistic, but you remained committed. I appreciate you for not giving up on me. I admire the passion you have for Q methodology. I hope to one day make you proud by being a major contributor to the scholarship.

Dr. Wallace Harris, thank you for getting me through the toughest part of the program. Who would have ever known that my classmate and cohort member would end up being my advisor. I would never be able to repay you for all of the work that you put into this dissertation. God, bless you Wallace because I know there were several times you wanted to call it quits but you stayed the course and I appreciate you for it.

Dr. JeffriAnne Wilder, thank you for being that voice of reason and listening ear when things would become too overwhelming and difficult during the process. I appreciate all of the work that you put into making sure my content was consistent and relevant. I learned a great deal from you regarding my position as a Black female in the academy. I can honestly say you have sparked an awareness in me that I did not have regarding Black females and leadership. I am grateful for the newfound area of interest; thanks for the introduction and for serving on my committee.

Dr. E. Newton Jackson, thank you for helping me to see things from every vantage point. I appreciate the depth and breadth of knowledge you brought to the discussion. Your

EXAMINING PERCEPTIONS OF BLACK

level of expertise is what caused me to stretch beyond what was comfortable, to ultimately reach the final destination. The university could stand to have more individuals like you who unapologetically tell the story how it really is. Your authenticity is what I valued most and what encouraged me to keep pushing during times I began to doubt myself.

Dr. Sophie Maxis, thank you for your invaluable guidance and support. Words cannot express my gratitude. This finished product would not be what it is without you. Thank you for the wealth of knowledge you have shared as you meticulously read through each page. Your knowledge of higher education, black studies, and q methodology made you a very strong asset to the team. I appreciate everything you brought to the table to make this a success.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	v
LIST OF TABLES	xiii
Abstract.....	xiv
CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION	15
Background.....	16
Statement of Problem.....	19
Statement of Purpose	20
Research Question	21
Research Methodology Overview	21
Theoretical Framework.....	21
Significance of the Study.....	23
Delimitations and Limitations	26
Assumptions.....	26
Researcher Positionality	27
Operational Definitions of Terms	31
Chapter Summary/Organization of the Study.....	32
CHAPTER II: REVIEW OF LITERATURE.....	34
Introduction.....	34
Mid-Level Administrators in Higher Education	35
Career Advancement.....	40
Racial Barriers.....	43
Critical Race Theoretical Framework.....	46

EXAMINING PERCEPTIONS OF BLACK

Tenet 1: Racism is Endemic in American life	50
Tenet 2: Counter-Storytelling	51
Tenet 3: Interest Convergence	52
Criticisms of CRT	53
Chapter Summary	53
CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY	55
Introduction.....	55
Theoretical Foundation of Q methodology.....	56
Research Question	58
Institutional Review Board Approval	59
Participants.....	59
The Concourse	60
Concourse Interviews	61
Concourse Refinement	64
Q Sample.....	65
Q Sort.....	66
Data Analysis	68
Correlation Matrix	69
Factor Analysis.....	70
Factor Rotation	70
Factor Loadings.....	71
Interpreting the Factors	71
Validity and Reliability	72
Chapter Summary	73

EXAMINING PERCEPTIONS OF BLACK

CHAPTER IV: RESEARCH FINDINGS	74
Analysis of Data.....	74
Factor Analysis	75
Factor Rotation	77
Factor Loadings	78
Correlations Between Factor Scores.....	79
Factor Characteristics	80
Factor Scores.....	81
Factor Interpretation	85
Factor 1: The Disconnected.....	86
Factor 2: The Disadvantaged.....	95
Factor 3: The Disrespected.....	103
Factor 4: The Dismissed.....	110
Factor 5: The Disinterested	116
Summary	122
CHAPTER V: DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION.....	124
Summary of the Study	132
Limitations	134
Implications for Future Researchers, Practitioners, and Policy Makers.....	137
Recommendations for Further Research.....	139
Conclusion	141
APPENDICES A-N.....	143
Appendix A: Participant Solicitation Letter-Interview and Questionnaire	144
Appendix B: Participant Solicitation Letter-Q Sample	146

EXAMINING PERCEPTIONS OF BLACK

Appendix C: Informed Consent Agreement for Study Participation.....	148
Appendix D: Informed Consent Agreement for Study Participation-Q Sort.....	150
Appendix E: Interview Protocol	152
Appendix F: Q Sorting Grid and Instructions.....	154
Appendix G: IRB Letter	155
Appendix H: Demographic Information Questionnaire	157
Appendix I: Communication Concourse	161
Appendix J: Q Sample	166
Appendix K: Post-Sort Questionnaire	169
Appendix L: Participant Demographic Information.....	172
Appendix M: Correlation Matrix.....	173
Appendix N: Unrotated Factor Matrix.....	177
REFERENCES	179

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 1: NATIONAL CENTER FOR EDUCATION STATISTICS 2013	24
TABLE 2: INTERVIEW PARTICIPANTS' DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION	63
TABLE 3: FACTOR LOADINGS	78
TABLE 4: CORRELATIONS BETWEEN FACTOR SCORES.....	79
TABLE 5: FACTOR CHARACTERISTICS.....	81
TABLE 6: NORMALIZED FACTOR SCORES -- FOR FACTOR 1	81
TABLE 7: FACTOR Q-SORT VALUES FOR EACH STATEMENT	83
TABLE 8: DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF PARTICIPANTS ON FACTOR 1	88
TABLE 9: HIGHEST FACTOR SCORES-FACTOR 1	89
TABLE 10: DISTINGUISHING STATEMENTS FOR FACTOR 1	93
TABLE 11: DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF PARTICIPANTS ON FACTOR 2	96
TABLE 12: HIGHEST FACTOR SCORES-FACTOR 2	97
TABLE 13: DISTINGUISHING STATEMENTS FOR FACTOR 2	101
TABLE 14: DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF PARTICIPANTS ON FACTOR 3	104
TABLE 15: HIGHEST FACTOR SCORES-FACTOR 3	105
TABLE 16: DISTINGUISHING STATEMENTS FOR FACTOR 3	108
TABLE 17: DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF PARTICIPANTS ON FACTOR 4	111
TABLE 18: HIGHEST FACTOR SCORES-FACTOR 4	112
TABLE 19: DISTINGUISHING STATEMENTS FOR FACTOR 4.....	115
TABLE 20: DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF PARTICIPANTS ON FACTOR 5	117
TABLE 21: HIGHEST FACTOR SCORES-FACTOR 5	118
TABLE 22: DISTINGUISHING STATEMENTS FOR FACTOR 5	121

Abstract

In spite of the research highlighting the significance of the presence of Black administrators to the success of Black students, there continue to be noticeable disparities in the representation of Black and White administrators in higher education. The racial and ethnic makeup of institutions of higher education does not reflect the demographics of the U.S. population. Black administrators are disproportionately underrepresented throughout academe, and are even more sparse at the executive levels of leadership. The purpose of this study was to examine the perceptions and attitudes of mid-level Black administrators with respect to progressing into executive-level administrative positions at predominantly White institutions. Relevant scholarly literature on mid-level administrators, career advancement, and racial barriers in higher education were examined. Three major tenets of Critical Race Theory (CRT) in education were used as a theoretical lens to examine racial inequities and disparities Black administrators experience in the academy. To address the research question and to explore the subjective viewpoints of the participants, Q methodology was utilized. After IRB approval, purposive sampling was used to recruit 40 Black mid-level administrators to participate in the study. All participants held one of the following titles: Director, Associate Director, Assistant Director, Dean, Associate Dean, Assistant Dean, and Manager. They each worked for a bachelor's degree granting public college or university. In addition to their title, the participants had to have earned at minimum a master's degree. Semi-structured interviews were held with 8 of the 40 participants. Content from interviews, questionnaires, and literature contributed to concourse development. By removing redundant and useless items, the concourse was refined and condensed from 90 statements to develop a Q sample of 41 statements. Through an online process, 40 participants sorted the 41 item Q sample that represented the full gamut of perspectives regarding the subject of career progression in higher education. In the sorting process, the participants ranked the statements based on their personal views and beliefs. A review and analysis of data resulted in five factors that categorize and represent the subjective viewpoints of the participants. The factor arrays, post-sort comments, distinguishing statements, and demographic details aided in interpreting and naming each factor. The five factors were named: Factor 1: *The Disconnected*, Factor 2: *The Disadvantaged*, Factor 3: *The Disrespected*, Factor 4: *The Dismissed*, and Factor 5: *The Disinterested*. Each factor was analyzed and interpreted to provide descriptions of how Black administrators perceive career progressions in higher education. Recommendations to expand the study were included.

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

Each year, during the first week of December, thousands of financial aid professionals from across the nation gather at the National Financial Aid Summit, the largest conference where financial aid professionals strategize and discuss the upcoming academic year's changes to the federal student aid guidelines. I have attended this conference each year since becoming a financial aid administrator in 2007. The week is typically filled with professional development sessions and workshops highlighting the newest and improved practices. The goal of the conference is to equip attendees with accurate information and the necessary tools to train their team members who were unable to attend.

As a financial aid administrator, I have found the “Ask-a-Fed” session, a platform in which financial aid professionals have the chance to ask pertinent questions and receive responses in a “real-time” fashion, to be an especially attractive aspect of the conference. This part of the conference brings together people from a variety of institutions. Each attendee wears a badge with their name, title, school and state printed on it. It is interesting to see how many people have the terms “President” or “Executive” embedded in their titles. It is even more thought-provoking to see how many of those people are not Black. From observation and candid conversations, it appears that, for the most part, Black administrators with those terms in their titles tend to be representing a Historically Black College or University (HBCU) or a minority scholarship office. The number of Blacks attending the conference and holding leadership positions reminds me of how underrepresented Blacks are in the academy. Through an inner dialogue, I try to comfort myself by saying that this will change one day. What is problematic for me is that very little has changed in the nine years I have been attending the conference. Although this conference is for financial aid administrators, data collected through the U.S.

Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) (2016), shows that the disparity I recognized in that sample of financial aid leaders exists in other areas of higher education administration as well.

As a Black female mid-level administrator, my experiences have greatly influenced the way in which I view the career mobility and progression of Black administrators in comparison to their White counterparts doing comparable jobs with similar or the same credentials. My own experiences influence how I understand the world around me; therefore, my perception of executive-level career disparities in higher education is subjective and personal in nature.

Background

Throughout the history of higher education, Black administrators have been disproportionately underrepresented in comparison to their White counterparts (Valverde, 2003). Within higher education, conversations about racial inequality and career disparities are often avoided because they are not easy conversations to have. For the purpose of laying a foundation for understanding why the career progression of Blacks does not mirror that of their White counterparts, a brief historical review of their roles in higher education is provided.

Prior to the Civil War, Blacks were not educated in many areas of the south (O'Brien, 1999). In fact, it was against the law for slaves to be taught to read or write (Joiner, Bonner, Shearouse & Smith, 1979). Changes to educational systems after the war ended allowed many Blacks to seek an education. Even though changes were in place, Blacks were still excluded from traditional institutions of higher education. As a workaround, Black owned and operated church based institutions of higher learning began to spring up (Franklin & Moss, 1988). As the desire for learning grew, more Blacks began to gather on a regular basis to teach each other how to read and write. For the most part, Blacks continued to study and work in separate educational

institutions until the noteworthy Supreme Court decision, *Brown vs. Board of Education of Topeka, Kansas* (1954). As time progressed, Blacks were eventually able to work in the very institutions that once excluded them. However, Caplow and McGee (1965) observed that even after the court order was put into place, the rate at which Blacks were hired was still very low in comparison to their White counterparts. Blacks at predominantly white institutions (PWIs) could be counted individually during the early twentieth century (Menges & Exum, 1983). Although times appeared to have changed, Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) provided the only real opportunity for Blacks to be hired or promoted in the academy (Wilson, 1989; Jackson, 2001). Jackson (1991) noted that the low representation of Black professionals and administrators on the campuses of PWIs prior to the 1960s could be attributed to deliberate restrictive practices. Jackson further stated that racially motivated practices were firmly enforced, causing Blacks to become hesitant when opportunities were available for fear of being rejected, discredited, or possibly dismissed. Mostly, Blacks were considered for diversity or multicultural related positions (Jackson, 2001). Jackson continued that eventually Blacks were allowed to hold director level positions, but they did not carry the same status as other non-diversity related administrative positions in the academy. Blacks are no longer faced with many of the same barriers as they once were in being considered for leadership opportunities (Allen, Epps, Guillory, Suh, & Bonous-Hammarth, 2000). The hiring of Blacks into upper-level leadership is a reflection of how times have changed, even if they are labeled as a token (Lindsay, 1997). However, the struggle continues in the Black community to acquire and maintain equitable employment. Racism and discriminatory practices are still found within the walls of educational institutions just as they are in any other workplace in the United States (Ladson-Billings, 1998). Lynn and Adams (2002) stated that educational establishments are the

primary environments where racism exists and has significant impacts on those involved. It has been noted that discriminatory practices observed in society are perpetuated in academia.

“Understanding the nature of race and racism in higher education is inseparable from understanding the nature of race and racism in our society” (Chesler, Lewis & Crowfoot, 2005, p. 7). Researchers have been adamant about characterizing institutions of higher education as mirroring what we see in society (Burke, Cropper, & Harrison, 2000; Zamani, 2003). Societal practices and experiences contribute to Black apprehension and fear of pursuing upper-level leadership positions. According to King and Watts (2004), Blacks have identified the fear of retaliation, not rejection, as one of the major reasons why they have been slow to advance to the top echelon of leadership in the academy. Blacks have learned to assimilate or to “go along to get along” so as to coexist and not be discounted (King & Watts, 2004, p. 118).

Jackson (2004) agreed that many techniques have been used to reach desired levels of diversity in higher education since the beginning of desegregation, but progress has been slow. Even with the onset of programs like affirmative action, which was supported by the federal government, Blacks continued to advance disproportionately slowly (Washington & Harvey, 1989). Meyers (1997) noted that affirmative action was a highly visible approach to implementing diversity, but that affirmative action programs were often mistaken for quota systems. Due to such misinterpretations, the policies became controversial and were in many cases considered flawed (Kaplin & Lee, 1995). Similar policies have been mandated by higher education governing boards, and could be credited with the increase in the number of Blacks hired or promoted into leadership roles. Change agents in support of such policies are labeled as new age “transformational leaders” committed to the idea of diversity and inclusion (Valverde, 2003). Many of their efforts appear to work until those leaders are ostracized, burned out, or lose

the desire to remain committed to the cause. In any case, change agents have to choose their racially centered battles carefully for fear of backlash. Valverde (2003) suggested that few people of color in higher education have been successful in moving into executive roles because postsecondary institutions are very effective in removing or eliminating change agents who advocate on behalf of them.

Statement of Problem

Rosser and Javinar (2003) stated that mid-level administrators are frustrated by lack of acknowledgement, role conflict, and the absence of opportunities for career advancement. Blacks not only have to contend with the same frustrations as a mid-level administrator but also have the added stress of dealing with racial barriers (Guillory, 2001). One of the most noticeable disparities in higher education is the lingering inability of Blacks to advance in their careers at the same rate as their White counterparts (Bennefield, 1999; Jackson & O'Callaghan, 2009a). Obstacles surrounding career advancement for Blacks in higher education are countless. Konrad and Pfeffer (1991) found that women and people of color are less likely to be hired in administrative and managerial positions, and when hired, assume lower level positions. What is puzzling and incomprehensible is how little has been done in higher education to address inconsistencies that are predicated on race. The lack of empirical data derived from studies of Black administrators contributes directly to the scarcity of relevant literature about career disparities across racial lines (Jackson, 2001). The deficit in the literature has posed a major problem as colleges and universities are limited in their ability to build a conceptual framework from past studies. Of the attempts made, virtually none of the studies has addressed the perceptions of Black administrators with regards to career advancement and progression beyond mid-level leadership. Examining Black administrators' lived experiences and anecdotes could

provide insight into how their perceptions are shaped as well as what actions should be taken.

Debating what measures should be taken to promote change will continue to be moot, as long as Black administrators' voices are not heard. Johnsrud, Heck, and Rosser (2000) found that administrators are impacted by "their perceptions of if they are being treated fairly, their opinions are being considered, and whether or not their work is meaningful" (p.54). In an effort to contribute to the scarce body of existing research, I used Critical Race Theory (CRT) as a framework to explore the perceptions of Black administrators regarding their ability to attain senior level administrative positions.

Statement of Purpose

The purpose of this study was to examine Black administrators' attitudes and perspectives regarding the accessibility and attainment of executive-level administrative opportunities. More specifically, Black administrators' subjective view of possibilities of advancing beyond mid-level administrative positions was sought. The results of the study could contribute to discussions on leadership and diversity by identifying the external and internal factors that prevent Black administrators from advancing into executive-level positions at the same rate as their white counterparts.

Black mid-level administrators were the participants in the study and thus provided a voice for this particular group of administrators. Through their experiences, an understanding of how they have viewed executive-level leadership opportunities was sought. There is a need to study the accessibility and attainment of executive-level leadership roles among Black administrators so that discriminatory barriers can be addressed and removed. Ideally, eliminating those factors would enable Black administrators to be able to serve at any administrative level within higher education for which they are qualified.

Research Question

The following research question guided the study to explore the experiences of Black administrators and to examine any factors that may prohibit career progression beyond mid-level administration: What are the attitudes and perspectives of Black mid-level administrators in higher education regarding barriers to the accessibility and attainment of executive-level leadership opportunities?

Research Methodology Overview

This study focused mainly on the subjective reality of Black administrators and their (in)ability to advance into executive level leadership positions in higher education. The use of this particular methodology not only provided a means to study Black administrators' viewpoints (McKeown & Thomas, 1988) but also enabled the participants to express their perspectives without any limitations being forced by the researcher. William Stephenson developed the Q methodology model in the 1930s for the purpose of studying people's subjective views, perspectives, and beliefs (Brown, 1980). Q methodology was chosen to garner a deeper understanding of experiences by analyzing "a person's communication of his or her point of view" (McKeown & Thomas, 1988, p.12).

Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework used in this study for understanding how Black mid-level administrators perceive their ability to advance into senior-level leadership positions in higher education was based on CRT. CRT has played a major role in uncovering and exposing inequities in institutions of higher education. Built on several basic principles, CRT is an examination of the effect of race, racism, and power on marginalized groups (Delgado &

Stefancic, 2001). Oftentimes, marginalized groups are discriminated against and have a difficult time proving their claims simply because the acts of oppression are not always easy to pinpoint.

Delgado (1989) referred to day to day overt or covert acts of racism toward people of color as microaggressions. Often these acts are committed without much thought on the part of the oppressor. In this study, the viewpoints or perspectives of Black mid-level administrators were examined. Narratives about their career paths and experiences were drawn from their interviews. CRT expresses the importance of providing a platform for which marginalized people are heard and considered. Delgado (1989) stated that counter-narratives or storytelling is important because it gives minorities a voice. When assessing the climate of an institution, counter-narratives can be very helpful because they can provide an insight into the realities of those who are impacted.

In this study the focus was on the viewpoints of the participants about important factors that have influenced their ability to advance to senior-level administrative positions. When used to bring awareness to the racial offenses to which marginalized groups are exposed, CRT has been found to be significant in critically addressing issues of equity and inclusion in institutions of higher learning (Ladson-Billings, 1998; Ladson-Billings & Tate, 2006), and has been recognized for helping to reform and reshape the culture of the academy. Issues of race are alive and well in today's institutions of higher learning, although many would like to say that we are living in a "post-racial" America where racial injustices are of the past (Freeman, 2011). Debates rage on about whether the Equal Employment Opportunity Act or other employment protection practices such as affirmative action have removed racism from the academy and whether Blacks are still being treated unfairly (Jackson, 2001; Zuberi & Bonilla-Silva, 2008; Bonilla-Silva, 2014). The problems of racial discrimination that Blacks face are also witnessed

within the academy, even with those equality programs in place (Zuberi & Bonilla-Silva, 2008). According to Crawford and Smith (2005) Black faculty and administrators on predominantly white campuses face significant barriers today just as they have in the past. To determine if their way of thinking has any credence, I used CRT to identify ways race affect Black mid-level administrators' career advancement into senior leadership as compared to their White counterparts.

Significance of the Study

A search for information on Black administrators in higher education revealed a noticeable deficit in the literature (Patitu & Hinton, 2003). Of the relevant literature available there was a limited number of newer references found on the topic. This research is significant because it expands upon a scant and old pool of literature by focusing solely on the attitudes and perceptions of Black administrators regarding barriers to the accessibility and attainment of executive level administration positions. Specifically, this research provides insight into the differences in the career progression experienced by Black administrators when compared to their White counterparts in higher education. As evidenced in data retrieved from the U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) (2016), Blacks are underrepresented at all levels of higher education. However, the significantly wider gaps found between Blacks and Whites at the managerial levels warrants a discussion.

The National Center for Education Statistics (NCES, 2016) reported that only 24,671 Black employees worked in an executive, administrative, or managerial role, compared to 196,132 White employees. This means that out of the 252,615 executive, administrative, and managerial positions in higher education, only 9.7 percent were held by Blacks. Data listed in the report were derived from institutions that grant associates' or higher degrees and administer Title

IV federal financial aid. Table 1 displays the total and percentage distribution of executive, administrative, and managerial professionals by race and ethnicity during 2013. The employment status of each of the employees can also be found in Table 1.

Table 1: National Center for Education Statistics 2013

Total Number of Executive/Administrative/Managerial Employees in Degree-Granting Postsecondary Institutions by Race/Ethnicity: Fall 2013				
Race	Full-Time	Part-Time	Total No. of Professionals	% of Total of Professionals
African American or Black	24,099	572	24,671	9.7
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,270	27	1,297	0.5
Asian	8,536	304	8,840	3.4
Hispanic	12,764	303	13,067	5.1
Pacific Islander	317	4	321	0.1
White	189,928	6,204	196,132	77.6
Other	7934	353	8,287	3.2
Total No. of Professionals	244,848	7,767	252,615	100

Note. Adapted from U.S. Department of Education, **National Center for Education Statistics**, Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS), spring 2014, Human Resources component, Fall Staff section. (This table was prepared March 2016.) Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d15/tables/dt15_314.40.asp

In addressing the underrepresentation of Blacks on campuses across the nation, Cross and Slater (2000) estimated that it could take more than two hundred years before Blacks are able to achieve parity with their White counterparts. There has been a move for institutions of higher education to incorporate diversity and inclusion into their vision and mission statements, yet the statistics (NCES, 2016) on leadership do not bear out the lofty diversity goals. The statistics

shows a large gap, especially at the executive level, which lead to the conclusion that diversity is given lip service where leadership is concerned.

Institutions of higher education have an important influence on college students' experiences and outcomes (Cabrera, Nora, Pascarella, Terenzini, & Hagedorn, 1999). It is challenging for minority students to contend with the dominant campus cultures of PWIs (Gonzales, 2003; Lewis, Chesler, & Forman, 2000). As institutions of higher education educate a growing population of multicultural students, diversity will be needed at all levels of administrative leadership (Jackson, 2004). It is important for students of color to see Blacks in professional and leadership roles. According to Gonzalez (2003) students thrive better in educational environments when they can relate to other Blacks in leadership positions who could help to positively shape their experiences and outcomes as members of racial and ethnic minorities. When considering the student body as a whole, the educational life of Black students should be taken into consideration. To aim to diversify the student body means to address the educational and cultural needs of all of the students enrolled. Black students who attend PWIs felt that the absence of Black faculty and staff as role models had irreversible effects on them (Boyd, 1979; Gruber, 1980; Matthews & Ross, 1975). The lack of relevant cultural viewpoints caused the Black students to feel isolated. Much remains to be learned about how the presence of Black professionals in leadership positions impact students of color as they navigate PWIs.

Information gathered in this study can be used by leaders of colleges and universities to develop strategies to improve the opportunities for Black administrators to access executive level leadership roles. In this study, a racial lens is used to determine whether Black administrators perceived race to be a challenge to career progression. The ultimate idea is to positively impact

the possibilities for Black administrators to advance in their higher education careers at a comparable rate to their White counterparts.

Delimitations and Limitations

The delimitations of this study are:

1. The viewpoints of Black middle-level administrators about career advancement were examined. The viewpoints of lower or upper level administrators were not considered.
2. The perspectives of Blacks are explored. No other race or ethnic group was included.
3. The sample size for this study was 40 participants. McKeown and Thomas (1988) found that small samples are not uncommon in studies that use Q methodology.

The limitations of this study are:

1. Due to the small number of participants and the methodology used, this study cannot be generalized to the entire Black population of middle-level academic administrators in the United States.
2. Transferability to a larger population is limited because the sample is too small.

Assumptions

It was assumed that a Q methodological approach would be effective in examining the perceptions and views of participants regarding the attainability and accessibility of executive-level administrative positions. Participants were mid-level administrators in higher education; therefore, it was assumed that they met the minimum qualifications and were eligible or desired to progress to the executive level if provided with the opportunity.

Researcher Positionality

McDowell (1992) stated that researchers have a responsibility to account for their position in relation to the participants included in the research as well as the setting. England (1994) added that a better understanding of the dynamics of research within one's culture is granted when the researcher's position in education, gender, race, culture, and class are provided. With a similar theme, Merriam (2002) declared that, prior to interviewing others, researchers should do a self-analysis and examine their experiences to pinpoint their own biases, prejudices, assumptions, and views. Once identified, these biases or other preconceived notions should be removed so that the research is not adversely influenced.

Since this study was based on subjectivity, it was imperative that I not compromise the research with my personal thoughts and assumptions. Researcher positionality could be considered to be a limitation because of the insider knowledge that I possess (Weis & Fine, 2000). Naples (2003) has identified insider research as the study of one's own social group. Other researchers added to the definition the importance of shared characteristics and the intimate knowledge of the community and its members (Loxley & Seery, 2008; Merton, 1972). In contrast, outsider research is undertaken when the researcher does not have any prior knowledge of the community, society, or its members (Merton, 1972). Both insider and outsider research have limitations that should be identified at the outset. It has been argued that the insider researcher's perception tends to be narrowed due to an overabundance of pre-existing knowledge surrounding the subject or topic (Aguiler, 1981). According to DeLyser (2001) the greater the familiarity, the more likely there will be a loss of objectivity, which can increase the risk of assumptions being made. In revealing my experiences or subjectivity, I was able to expose any biases I may have possessed. Purposely, I made the attempt to cast aside any

personal assumptions or preconceptions to remove the possibilities of negatively or positively influencing the research.

In a study that is framed by CRT the researcher's voice is just as necessary as the data being presented; Black researchers or writers "need to justify who they are and describe where they come from as part of the description of where they want to go" (Culp, 2000, p. 488).

Ladson-Billings' (2000) description of researcher positionality aligns with my stance or situation as the researcher within this study:

CRT asks the critical qualitative researcher to operate in a self-revelatory mode, to acknowledge the double (or multiple) consciousness in which she is operating. My decision to deploy a critical race theoretical framework in my scholarship is intimately linked to my understanding of the political and personal stake I have in the education of Black children. All of my "selves" are invested in this work—the self that is a researcher, the self that is a parent, the self that is a community member, the self that is a Black woman. (p. 272)

For this study, to unveil my views and perceptions, it was important for me to acknowledge my experiences and positionality as a Black woman working in higher education administration. I present as a Black female whose stance is that of an advocate for racial parity and equality. For the past eight years, I have worked for two different institutions of higher education within the state of Florida. For the first five years of my career, I worked as a coordinator in the financial aid office before being promoted into mid-level administration as a director of financial aid. In addition, I was a charter member and membership chair for an African American Faculty and Staff Association. I earned my master's degree in Educational

Leadership with a focus in Postsecondary and Adult Studies, and was entered into candidacy for my doctorate in Educational Leadership during the summer of 2012.

The idea for this study evolved from my own experiences with career mobility and progression as an employee in higher education. The two Florida institutions for which I previously worked are both PWIs. Very few Black professionals work for either institution at any level, especially at the top of the hierarchy. This phenomenon was not altogether new for me. I received my Bachelor's degree at a four-year private college with only a 3.6% Black student population. From the beginning of my education career, I have learned to adapt to the idea of being one of few Blacks "chosen". In other words, I have been described on many occasions as being the "token". When hired to work in the loan department, I was the only Black female working at that capacity. There were other Black employees in leadership positions, but there were not nearly as many Blacks working in administrative positions as in physical facilities. The Blacks in leadership positions worked mostly in jobs related to diversity or race. Unlike many of them, I worked in a non-race related position. This status made me a minority amongst the minorities. Even though I held a lower-level leadership position, I was paid less than others who were doing the same or a very similar job. Other Blacks throughout the college perceived my influence and power to be more than it was simply because I was one of few Blacks to hold a position at that level. The perception did not meet the reality. When considering my education and skills, I now know that I was grossly underpaid, underemployed, and undervalued.

Eventually I was promoted to a higher level in leadership that aligned with my professional and educational skills. My promotion into a mid-level leadership position came two years after multiple failed attempts. Each attempt resulted in someone who was less qualified, in

both work experience and education, being chosen for the job. This pattern existed and could be witnessed across the institution. It has been my observation that the most qualified candidate, in many cases, does not always receive the offer for the job. My current place of employment has a significant number of Blacks working in mid-level leadership positions but very few working at the executive level.

In conducting this study, I was interested in exploring the viewpoints of mid-level Black higher education administrators. According to Merriam (2002) it is important that the researcher make the attempt to bring as much transparency to the process as possible by clarifying their point of view regarding the topic. This might also provide a deeper understanding for why the researcher interpreted the data in the manner in which it was done. I chose Q methodology because it allowed me to maintain my own point of view regarding the topic without having influencing the results. In Q methodology, the participants and not the researcher provide a means for examining and understanding their lived experiences through their sorting patterns.

To examine the experiences of Black mid-level administrators working in higher education, I used CRT as a theoretical framework. I wanted to use a framework that focused on race in an educational setting because it directly aligns with my personal experiences and reality. As a Black woman working in higher education and a self-proclaimed “insider-researcher”, I have experienced firsthand some of the blatant forms of racial barriers to career mobility outlined in this study. Contacts and networks are often found at the top of the list of factors that work in favor of being hired when candidates are being considered for positions. Being politically connected has been known to directly impact the opportunities or lack thereof afforded to Blacks when being considered for career advancement. Unfortunately, neither institution has made much progress in hiring more Blacks into leadership positions, even when the number of Black

students enrolled has grown exponentially. CRT assisted in my ability to identify some of the racially involved issues that is going on around me every day in the academy.

Operational Definitions of Terms

For purposes of this study and in an effort to provide a precise understanding of the research, operational definitions of the following terms are provided below:

African American: A citizen of the United States of America with ancestry from any of the Black racial groups that descended from Africa (Fox, 2001).

Critical Race Theory (CRT): A theoretical framework, developed in the mid-1970s from Critical Legal Studies, used to critically examine race and racism from a legal perspective (Delgado & Stefancic, 2001).

Higher or upper-level/ senior-level/executive-level administrators: Full-time employees with high ranks charged with managing major responsibilities or a specific subset of them. Position titles found at this level usually are Assistant or Associate Provost, Provost, Vice Chancellor, Chancellor, Assistant or Associate Vice President, Vice President, and President (Penn, 1990).

Higher education: Study offered beyond secondary school at an institution where the completion of the program yields an associate, baccalaureate, or higher degree (National Center for Education Statistics, 2012).

Lower-level/ entry-level administrators: Full-time employees with minimal, if any supervisory duties. Professionals in this tier of administration usually have frequent student contact (Burkard, Cole, Ott & Stoflet, 2005).

Middle or mid-level administrators: Full-time employees who are not a part of the senior-level leadership but are charged with carrying out decisions of senior-level leadership while supervising and managing day to day operations (Penn, 1990).

Predominantly white institutions (PWIs): Any institution of higher learning in which more than 50% of the administration, faculty, staff, and student body are of European descent (Williams, 1989).

Racial microaggressions: Spoken or unspoken insults based on distinguishing characteristics such as race, color, and ethnicity that may be subtle in nature and unconsciously directed at Blacks (or other racially marginalized groups) (Smith, 2006; Smith, Yosso, & Solórzano, 2007; Solórzano, Ceja, & Yosso, 2000; Sue, 2010).

Voice: Personification of participants' perspectives, views and experiences. Within the construct of CRT, a method for the marginalized or oppressed to communicate their lived experiences (Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995).

Chapter Summary/Organization of the Study

This study employed an approach that took into consideration the perceptions and attitudes of Blacks who hold mid-level academic administrative positions. The disparity between Black administrators and their White counterparts is noticeable in the world of academia, especially at the executive levels of administration. CRT is the theoretical framework, and Q methodology is the research method, that were used to give a “voice” to those directly impacted by the disparities between Black and White mid-level administrators regarding the rate at which they progress into executive-level administration positions.

The remainder of this dissertation consists of four chapters. Chapter II presents a review of pertinent literature addressing (a) the role, job scope, and responsibilities of mid-level administrators in higher education, (b) factors that impact career advancement and mobility for Blacks, (c) racial barriers experienced by Blacks in higher education, and (d) CRT as the theoretical framework. Chapter III describes in detail the research design and methodology of the

study. In Chapter IV, analysis of data and the results of the study are discussed. Chapter V summarizes the findings, discusses the results, presents conclusions, and provides recommendations for future research.

CHAPTER II: REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to present a review of pertinent literature to provide a basis for understanding the factors that affect upward mobility and career advancement for Black mid-level administrators in higher education. Although upper- and lower-level administrators' experiences were considered for comparison purposes, Black administrators operating in mid-level administration positions were the focus of this review. In general, information regarding experiences of Black men and women administrators in higher education is scarce. Of the literature available, much the focus is on Black women. Black women appear to be much more interesting to study because they are often viewed as being aggressive and masculine (Weitz & Gordon, 1993). Their low salaries in comparison to their counterparts are also at the forefront of discussions (Guillory, 2001). Studies show that Black women disproportionately hold positions that involve promoting diversity-related affairs or initiatives for students (Konrad & Pfeffer, 1991; Moses, 1997). Black women have both race and gender to contend with, which places them at the bottom of the list for career opportunities and conversely at the top of the list for research.

This review is organized into three sections. The first section outlines information about the roles, job scope/depth, and responsibilities of mid-level administrators so as to provide an understanding of their importance to the organizational structure. The second section addresses factors and practices that influence career advancement for Blacks in higher education. The third section discusses racial barriers and hurdles faced by Black administrators. Identifying such barriers helps in understanding why Black administrators advance at slower rates than their

White counterparts. Finally, CRT is discussed as a theoretical framework for examining how racial barriers affect the career mobility and progression of Black mid-level administrators in higher education.

Mid-Level Administrators in Higher Education

Mid-level administrators comprise the largest administrative group working in most college settings (Rosser, 2000). These experienced administrators usually hold advanced degrees and are dedicated to their professions. Additionally, they are responsible for making sure the missions of their institutions are carried out (Young, 2007). Research focusing on entry- and senior-level administrators is plentiful and readily available, but in spite of their importance and contributions, mid-level administrators receive cursory treatment (Johnsrud & Rosser, 1999; Kane, 1982; Winston & Creamer, 1997; Young, 1990).

The most research centered on mid-level administrators in the late 20th century was from Scott (1975, 1980), who claimed mid-level administrators and their purpose were not understood. Scott labeled mid-level administrators as the “unheralded heroes” who work to keep the institution operating at an optimum level (p.387). Johnsrud and Rosser (1999) reaffirmed Scott’s claim of mid-level administrators being neglected in higher education literature. Young (1990) wrote a book about mid-level administrators titled *The Invisible Leaders: Student Affairs Mid-Managers*. Even as numbers grew, mid-level administrators remained relatively unnoticed in the literature.

In response to the expansion of mid-level administration, Scott (1975, 1980) wrote about how colleges needed to hire more people to take on day to day supervisory operations. Rhoades and Slaughter (1997) noted that the number of mid-level administrators had doubled since the 1970s. Colleges and universities began spending more money to address new demands that were

based on increased enrollment. These non-faculty professionals were being hired at twice the rate as faculty (Grassmuck, 1991). As administrative demands increased so did the need for mid-level administrators. Yet years after Scott (1980) conducted his study, Young (1990) claimed that still very little had been written about mid-level administrators. Since 2000 research focusing on mid-level administrators has begun to appear because of their importance in the organizational structure.

Researchers have found it challenging when seeking to compare information about mid-level administrators among historical studies due to the lack of a common definition. Fey (1991) affirmed that one of the main problems of identifying a mid-level administrator is there is no consistent definition from institution to institution. Fey (1991) offered that using titles can become confusing because certain titles do not denote the same level of responsibility from one institution to another. However, it has been noted that titles such as Director, Associate Director, Assistant Director, Assistant Dean, Associate Dean, and Dean are most commonly used as mid-level administrative titles (Johnsrud, Heck, & Rosser, 2000; Mills, 1993). The distinctive need for support is another characteristic that sets mid-level administrative positions apart from others and adds to the difficult task of defining their role and importance (Scott, 1975; Young, 1990). Job function and tenure are some of the other categories that have been used for identifying or defining mid-level administrators.

Without question, the paucity of literature regarding mid-level administrators is puzzling when they appear to contribute so much to the day to day functioning of college and university campuses. Mid-level administrators can be found in just about all areas of an institution of higher education. They work in academic as well as non-academic areas (Kraus, 1983; Rosser, 2004). However, faculty typically do not fall into the mid-level administrator category because mid-

level administrators are frequently hired without annual contracts. According to Mills (1993), mid-level administrators usually report directly to top-level administrators or officers, and are charged with making sure communication is channeled up and down the hierarchy. Their job responsibilities could vary based on the area in which they work, but providing leadership, supervision, and guidance is at the top of their long list of duties (Fey, 1991; Mills, 1993). Mills (2000) asserted that mid-level administrators are responsible for maintaining a broad overview of institutional issues as they go about their assigned tasks. Depending on what those tasks entail, the sum total of their responsibilities could be a very tall order.

Oddly enough, the job satisfaction of mid-level administrators seems to be unaffected by the nature or volume of their responsibilities (Rosser, 2000). Rosser & Javinar (2003) found that mid-level administrators' morale and job satisfaction is impacted the most by career development and advancement or the lack thereof. Support for career growth is essential to mid-level administrators' morale because great value is placed on the opportunity to grow as professionals within the academy. After interviewing and surveying 200 mid-level administrators in the mid-to late 1970s, Scott (1980) was able to provide some insight into this growing population of professionals. In a metaphor about the English middle class, Scott used English titles to label mid-level administrators. He offered examples that compared mid-level administrators to the "lords, squires, and yeomen" caught in the middle of the hierarchy. In Scott's analogy, mid-level administrators are between the entry-level and executive-level administrators, much like the English lords, squires and yeomen were positioned between the kings and peasants. Their career mobility is limited because they are wedged in the middle of the ranks.

Career advancement is greatly affected by mid-level administrators' position in the organizational structure (Scott, 1980). Advancement opportunities were at the forefront of mid-level administrators' frustrations, but other shared hindrances were identified. Scott (1980) reported that mid-level administrators were often discouraged by the lack of respect they received from faculty and upper-level administrators. The feeling of being dismissed or unappreciated caused mid-level administrators to seek support from other affiliations or associations that encouraged professional development and growth. Scott (1980) listed a lack of training, recognition, authority, compensation, and guidance from upper-level administration as additional issues faced by mid-level administrators. The aforementioned factors can have a negative and irreversible effect on both the morale and motivation of those experiencing them, thus causing dissatisfaction and even possibly retaliation. Vroom (1964) claimed that for a person to exhibit an optimum level of performance, they need to have the ability to perform and also be motivated to do so.

Mid-level administrators often face the conundrum of enforcing rules that they had no involvement in making. Johnsrud (1996) reported on the difficulties experienced by mid-level administrators who have to walk a fine line between those whom they manage and those to whom they report. Frustration seemed to heighten when the mid-level administrators were charged with gathering and analyzing data that could influence the decision-making process of which they were not a part. In many cases, mid-level administrators were frustrated by being viewed as mere day to day managers who lacked the intelligence to make decisions about the very processes and procedures they were managing. For this reason, many mid-level administrators did not feel empowered and decided to disconnect from both their superiors and subordinates altogether.

One of the gaps identified in the literature was the need for a consolidated list of professional skills and competencies needed to qualify for mid-level administrators' positions (Lemoine, 1985; Kane, 1982; Roberts, 2003). Roberts (2003) suggested that the varied position descriptions and titles for those operating at the mid-level have made it increasingly difficult to identify a required set of skills or minimum qualifications to be successful. Two decades earlier, Kane (1982) attempted to identify the skills needed for mid-level administrators to advance to the next level. In a survey, Kane organized 64 skills into seven categories. There were 811 surveys issued and the response rate was more than 75%. The categories listed on the survey were fiscal management, leadership, personnel management, student contact, research and evaluation, professional development, and communication. Kane and grouped the responses by department or area of expertise, gender, and school type. Three years later, Lemoine (1985) duplicated Kane's (1982) efforts by surveying 817 mid-level administrators. More than 60% responded from approximately 200 colleges to identify whether any new skills should be added to the list that Kane had formulated. Like Kane, Lemoine compiled a consolidated list of skills that mid-level administrators identified as essential to their success.

Other researchers aligned their studies with Kane's work, but Roberts (2003) included additional categories including diversity and legal issues. Roberts also expanded the study to add entry-level and top-level administrators. Roberts was concerned with what was perceived to be ideal methods of skill attainment. Although differences were identified among all three levels of administrators, Roberts found that mid-level and top-level administrators had more in common than any other combination. Roberts attributed the similarities to the levels of responsibility and types of duties at the entry level versus the mid- and upper levels.

Career Advancement

Much of the literature (e.g. Jackson, 2001) centers on Black administrators' focus on recruitment and retention but not on career advancement or mobility. Researchers have defined career advancement as the upward movement of an individual into higher positions with increased responsibilities and/or compensation (Mills, 1993; Sagaria & Johnsrud, 1988). For the purposes of this study, career advancement factors are defined as individual issues, ideas, behaviors, or practices that impact career advancement.

In a survey of Black student affairs administrators, Coleman (2002) identified 27 significant career advancement factors, both facilitators and barriers that influence the advancement of administrators from mid-level to senior level. Factors included networking opportunities, gender discrimination, education level, and mentoring (Coleman, 2002). Coleman's purpose was to identify and explore the perceptions of career progression held by Black student affairs personnel. Coleman examined the impacts of gender, institutional characteristics, highest earned degree, and professional experience on their perceptions (2002). Interest in Black mid-level administrators stemmed from their historical experience of facilitators and barriers that influenced their career advancement (Konrad & Pfeffer, 1991).

Most institutions of higher learning mission statements include diversity and inclusion verbiage, but there is a distinctive disconnect between the words and actions about multiculturalism, especially in terms of levels of administration (Guillory, 2001). Colleges and universities have shown great improvement in their commitment to diversity in their student bodies, but such is not the case in administration (Jackson, 2001). As student bodies grow, a much deeper commitment to student body diversity has been demonstrated; however, the same

cannot be said about leadership roles, especially those that usually would lead to a college presidency (Jackson, 2004).

Issues that have contributed to the differences in career advancement for minorities have been presented by several researchers (Coleman, 2002; Herbrand, 2001; Kanter, 1977, 1993; Lunsford, 1984; Smith, 1998). In Kanter's (1977, 1993) analyses of men and women in a corporate organization, the topic of limited opportunities for career advancement was discussed in great detail. Kanter argued that White men often hold a majority status in organizations, which places them in a position where they are more likely to advance more quickly in their careers than women and racial/ethnic minorities. The study showed that minorities were also faced with the added challenges of being underestimated. Their professional skills were not taken seriously, thus minorities were often excluded from professional networking experiences that could potentially lead to being promoted.

Kanter's primary focus was on race, but other researchers focused more on factors such as years of experience and degree attainment for examining career advancement (Coleman, 2002; Herbrand, 2001; Lunsford, 1984; Rickard, 1985; Rolle, 1998; Smith, 1998). More than 50% of the participants in Coleman's (2002) study had served in a professional position in higher education for ten years or more. Herbrand (2001) considered ten years of professional experience in higher education to be a minimum requirement for administrators to advance into their first senior-level position. While some researchers focused on years of experience at a certain level, others centered their studies on the types and number of positions held prior to becoming eligible to advance. Rickard (1985) claimed that most administrators held several professional positions before being selected for a senior-level position. Lunsford (1984) echoed Rickard in emphasizing the significance of holding mid-level administrator positions before advancing to the next level.

Whether considering the impact of years of experience or number of professional positions held, the discussion was inconclusive. Therefore, the question of the bearing of professional experience on career advancement for Black administrators still remains.

Terminal degrees were also perceived as factors that facilitate career advancement (Lunsford, 1984). Lunsford discovered that Black female administrators in higher education were more likely than their White female counterparts to think that degrees obtained at the doctoral level guaranteed career advancement (Smith, 1998). In Rolle's study (1998), all of the participants who were senior-level administrators had also earned a doctoral degree.

In the aforementioned studies, the participants were Black or White administrators that had earned their graduate degrees and perceived the attainment of doctoral degrees as a means for advancement in their careers (Coleman, 2002; Lunsford, 1984; Rolle, 1998; Smith, 1998). However, Black administrators experienced the most barriers to career advancement (Coleman, 2002; Smith, 1998). This is an example of the inconsistency that exists within the academy that can be identified as a major contributor to the underrepresentation of Black administrators serving in executive-level positions.

Issues of Black women in higher education were the focus of many other studies. Patitu and Hinton (2003) based their research on concerns regarding the needs of Black women administrators and faculty not being met. They found that this population lacked mentoring as well as clear expectations, which caused them to lag behind their White counterparts with respect to career advancement. Advancement and mobility are often impacted by the presence or absence of the right connections within the institution. Networking and mentoring have both been found to be important to career progression (Coleman, 2002). Patitu and Hinton (2003) noted that some of the women who responded felt that they were being held to higher standards

and that the unspoken expectations were impossible to ever master. Patitu and Hinton's study exposed a practice that is found throughout the literature to be common: Black women are often penalized for not meeting the standards that they do not know they are being measured by. The recommendation that resulted from this study was for institutions to consider making some structural modifications, such as instituting a mentorship system that would help to foster an environment of support (Patitu & Hinton, 2003).

Racial Barriers

Although laws prohibit blatant racism and discrimination in the work place, Blacks experience subtle racism on a daily basis. One of the main tenets of CRT asserts that racism is woven into the fabric of America; it is experienced daily by people of color (Delgado, 1989; Feagin, 2006). Daily acts of racism are often unintentional. Delgado (1989) identified these subtle acts of racism as microaggressions. The offender rarely knows when they are being offensive because the acts are subtle. However, the person against whom such acts are directed is aware of the microaggressions as soon as they are done. Microaggressions are described as "brief and commonplace daily verbal, behavioral, or environmental indignities, whether intentional or unintentional, that communicate hostile, derogatory, or negative racial slights and insults toward people of other races" (Sue, 2010, p. 271).

Organizational or institutional barriers can cause people of color to become discouraged from pursuing career advancement opportunities. Jackson and O'Callaghan (2009b) listed barriers including the following:

lack of access to professional networks for particular racial groups, a lack of appropriate role models, segregated networks of professionals, a lack of mentors for individuals of specific racial and ethnic groups, the lack of a postgraduate or terminal degree, the lack

of fluency in a foreign language, and work in academic departments or settings in which individuals are unwilling to reorganize their work or priorities around issues of cultural diversity (p. 42)

Kanter (1993) found that it is not uncommon for minorities to conform to the environment around them, especially when they are heavily outnumbered. Employers often seek people who will mesh well with the organizational culture, which is generally based on standard PWI standards. The organizational fit screening is a means to reach a desired level of organizational efficiency (Carbado & Gulati, 2003). In an attempt to obtain employment, Blacks have to demonstrate their ability to adapt to the organizational culture. In many cases, Blacks may feel the need to assimilate and mirror the behaviors of their coworkers. Such behavior modification may be exhibited in their style of dress, which may mimic what is considered to be appropriate attire or the trends in the dominant culture. Blacks have been known to alter their diction, dialect, and tone when in the presence of White counterparts for fear of being labeled as ignorant or uneducated. Kanter (1993) found cases where Blacks have gone as far as to change their names to mask their true ethnic identity. Often, limited career advancement opportunities have been attributed to assumptions made based on racially motivated stereotypes (Holmes, 2003).

Rolle, Davies, and Banning (2000) found that it has become a major battle for Blacks to be accepted into majority society. In their study, Black administrators spoke freely about fearing that they did not measure up and were constantly seeking to prove their leadership abilities to the institution. Ladson-Billings and Donner (2005) found that Black administrators are constantly forced to legitimize themselves. It has been noted throughout the literature that Black administrators commonly do not believe that they have been fully supported and respected as

educational professionals. Harvey (1999) claimed that there has been very little excitement or enthusiasm about motivating Blacks to seek senior level positions of leadership because of the perception that they lack the tools necessary to be successful. Jackson (2004) added that Black administrators are grossly underrepresented in senior levels of administration and decision-making positions. Until barriers of racism are removed from higher education, Blacks will continue to lag behind in terms of career advancement.

In the rare cases where Blacks are promoted to senior-level administration, a misconception is that their position and power insulates them from racial barriers (Feagin, 1991). Blacks face discrimination at every level. Interestingly, Blacks who find themselves in upper-level administrative positions often have to defend and define their “Blackness”. Wilder (2015) posited that skin tone has played a major part in how Blacks are viewed by the academy as well as each other. Not only do Black professionals have to contend with the misconstructions and misconceptions held by Whites, but with battles fought within their own racial group as well. This idea of the “Black elite” dates back to after the Reconstruction era when light-skinned Blacks received preferential treatment compared to darker skinned Blacks. The idea of colorism exists today in the view that a Black person could not be promoted based on their merit and skills, but because they have met some sort of unpublished color requirement. Whenever a person of lighter complexion has been promoted, colorism is often used to explain how that person was chosen.

Since very few Black administrators are promoted to the executive level, the fortunate few are often labeled the Black “token” employee. It is often said that Blacks are hired into positions to fill the quotas mandated by affirmative action requirements. Kanter’s (1993) theory of tokenism was based on the experiences of women in a male dominated business world, and it

has since been generalized to other marginalized groups. Racial tokenism was also developed from Kanter's original theory; it refers to Blacks being placed in elevated or highly visible positions to be the experts in all things race-related. Kanter considers such tokenism to be a racial barrier that causes Blacks to feel they have been placed in a position to be envied by members of their own cultural group.

Critical Race Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework chosen to support this study was CRT. CRT is considered to be a viable method for examining race in an educational or any other social institution (Parker & Lynn, 2002). In this study, CRT was used as a lens to explore the lived experiences and realities of Blacks working in mid-level administrative positions in higher education. The aim was to use CRT to reframe the racial disparities and career gaps observed throughout higher education, to counter the fact that higher education administration has historically been discussed, taught, and investigated primarily from the white male perspective (Jackson & O'Callaghan, 2009a).

In the mid-1970s, sparked by dissatisfaction with Critical Legal Studies (CLS), scholars Derrick Bell and Alan Freeman began working toward revitalizing actions that spun out of the civil rights movement (Delgado & Stefancic, 2001; Ladson-Billings, 1998; Tate, 1997). CLS was initially organized to challenge or reverse legal practices that upheld the dominance of any one party or class; it was a movement to discontinue the use of the law as a tool to further oppress marginalized groups. While notable strides were made, lawyers, scholars, and other advocates became increasingly impatient with CLS. According to Delgado and Stefancic (2001) the CRT movement was born out of discontent that CLS was moving too slowly toward critiquing and changing societal and legal structures. "The Critical Race Theory movement is a collection of

activists and scholars interested in studying and transforming the relationship among race, racism, and power” (Delgado & Stefancic, 2001, p. 3).

Although it was rooted in legal studies, over time CRT began to expand into other applicable disciplines. Introduced into the field of education in the 1990s, CRT was identified as a plausible way of exposing inequities in education (Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995). In their article “Toward a Critical Race Theory of Education,” Ladson-Billings and Tate (1995) argued for a critical race theoretical perspective to be recognized in education. They asserted that CRT could be used in education to help identify injustices in the educational system as had been done in legal studies. The aim was then what it remains today, which is to provide those directly impacted by racism with a voice. More specifically, CRT, when merged with education, is used as a conduit for students of color to tell of their experiences with racial inequities in an educational setting (Yosso, 2006).

The relevance of CRT to the legal decision-making process as it affects education has been noticeable, especially when decisions were made based on data that claimed to be “colorblind” (Aleman, 2009; Lopez, 2003). For example, in *Parents Involved in Community Schools v. Seattle* (2007), the Supreme Court ruled that race-consciousness is permissible in K-12 assignment plans (Wise, 2014). CRT has been not only a valuable framework for evaluating educational policies and policy-making practices, but also for critically analyzing racial exclusion and other discriminatory practices (Ladson-Billings, 1998; Solórzano & Delgado Bernal, 2001). A substantial goal of CRT was to create a platform for racial inequality in the legal system to be addressed and corrected. CRT was interpreted by Matsuda (1991) as:

the work of progressive legal scholars of color who are attempting to develop jurisprudence that accounts for the role of racism in American law and that

works toward the elimination of racism as part of a larger goal of eliminating all forms of subordination. (p. 1331)

CRT has become a useful tool in recognizing, investigating, and challenging racism. Scholars of CRT engage in an evolving process of trying to explain how race impacts society (Tate, 1997). Race is commonly referred to as a normal part of American society; therefore, CRT has become valuable in combating the effects racism has on marginalized groups (DeCuir & Dixon, 2004; Delgado, 1995; Ladson-Billings, 1998). However, it has become increasingly difficult to interrogate racism because many do not consider it to be an issue that still exists and requires attention; but this opinion is quickly negated whenever data are drawn and analyzed. Ladson-Billings and Tate (2006) pointed out that racial inequity in the United States can easily be identified by doing an analysis of statistical and demographic data. Dei, Karumanchery, and Karumanchery-Luik (2007) asserted that it has become common to say that racism no longer exists and skin color does not matter, but racism is real and it does not disappear simply because its existence is denied. Dismissing the concept of race provides permission for the conversation to be silenced.

In order to get beyond persistent racial disparities and to realize the vision for a version of American higher education that is truly equitable and inclusive, we must first take account of racism and its harmful effects on people in postsecondary contexts. (Harper, 2012, p.22)

The ongoing debate over racism stems from the inability to confidently define and discuss what it is or what it represents. Racism is such a complex and complicated process that it is often misinterpreted. Racism should not be confused with discrimination or bigotry. According to Sue (2010), racism involves power to carry out systemic discriminatory practices on a

continuous basis; therefore, it is different from racial prejudice, hatred, or discrimination.

Although racism may not appear to be as blatant and as obvious as it once was, racially-based practices and exclusions still exist and actions must be taken to curtail them. Ladson-Billings (1998) acknowledged that as long as there are differences and equality is nothing more than a myth, data will continue to be gathered and research will be conducted that proves otherwise.

CRT is framed by several basic tenets (DeCuir & Dixson, 2004; Delgado & Stefancic, 2001; Matsuda, 1987) that guide the work of the CRT movement:

1. Racism is endemic to American life.
2. Whiteness as property
3. Interest convergence
4. The use of counter-storytelling or counter narratives
5. The critique of liberalism.

CRT has been used to establish frameworks across many different disciplines. It is logical to assume that not everyone may subscribe to every tenet within the CRT framework; each individual's point of reference is usually the determining factor. Therefore, the tenets that were relevant to this study and most used in higher education were explored. The following three tenets were used to help construct an explanatory framework that recognizes the role that race and racism play in the career progression of Black mid-level administrators in higher education: racism is endemic in America; counter-storytelling and counter-narratives; and interest convergence (DeCuir & Dixson, 2004; Ladson-Billings, 1998). The tenets listed were identified by Matsuda, Lawrence, Delgado, and Crenshaw (1993) as central to CRT and provide a foundation for being able to examine college campuses.

Tenet 1: Racism is Endemic in American life

Of the tenets used, this one lays the foundation for this study and tells us that people of color experience racism on a daily basis because it is normal and an integral part of America. CRT affirms that race is an inherent and unavoidable part of American society. It is manifest in our customs, traditions, beliefs, values, and experiences. Racism influences the manner in which business is conducted and relationships are built in America. In many cases racism is difficult to identify because it is so intertwined into society that it is virtually undetectable.

CRT considers race and racism to play a vital role in socially, politically and educationally constructed experiences. Lopez (2003) found that we do not address racism because it has become normalized; therefore, it is taken for granted. American schools are held under scrutiny by CRT, and closely monitored. Any educational institution utilizing racist practices is subject to being critiqued by CRT.

The main objective of CRT is to dismantle the relationship among race, racism, and power (Delgado & Stefancic, 2001). Bell (1992) argued in favor of the fight against racism, deeming it both necessary and meaningful. Recognizing the realities of racism, Bell (1992) predicted:

Black people will never gain full equality in this country, even those Herculean efforts we hail as successful will produce no more than temporary “peaks of progress”, short-lived victories that slide into irrelevance as racial patterns adapt in ways that maintain white dominance. (pp. 373-374)

As a self-proclaimed racial realist, Bell’s frustration and intolerance with acts of racism led to conversations based on racism being a normal part of American society. In the many discussions Bell organized on race, racism, and power, a number of views about racial oppression were

challenged and confronted. In challenging views and perspectives that claimed race was no longer a factor, Bell, along with other scholars, brought to the forefront racial issues that were in need of addressing.

CRT is the approach that will provide the lens by which the career progression of Black mid-level administrators will be examined. Are racial barriers causing Black administrators' careers to be stunted, preventing them from advancing beyond mid-level administration? If so, how can CRT be used to combat such practices so that the playing field can be level? Some researchers contend that meritocracy or level playing fields are attractive myths, but will never be achieved (Zamudio, Russell, Rios, & Bridgeman, 2011).

Tenet 2: Counter-Storytelling

Matsuda (1991) suggested that counter-storytelling is one of CRT's most critical tenets. Unlike some of the other tenets, counter-storytelling is often used as a component of educational research whenever CRT is deployed. The premise of counter-storytelling is to question or challenge the legitimacy of established myths held by the majority (Delgado & Stefancic, 2001, p. 144). Providing marginalized groups with a voice, through counter-storytelling, brings to the surface their lived experiences. Thus, counter-storytelling assists marginalized groups in providing others with an insight into what life actually looks like from their perspective (Delgado & Stefancic, 2001). Through the use of counter-storytelling, majority discourses are contradicted and interrogated.

In the course of this work, Black administrators used counter-storytelling to describe their perceptions of career progression and disparities. The participants had an opportunity to reflect on factors that have affected their career progression. More specifically, they were asked to recall any factors that they perceived to be racially charged. CRT is built on the premise of

recognizing the detailed accounts of those with experience for the purpose of dissecting how race impacts marginalized people. Delgado (1984) reported that many White legal scholars believed that as long as the story is being told and awareness is being brought forth, it does not matter what the race of the person is. Harper (2012) countered that it matters who is telling the story and whose voice is being included in race-related scholarship.

It has been argued that the voices of marginalized people are perceived differently, because they come from a completely different frame of reference (Solórzano & Yosso, 2001). Their experiences shape their perceptions, which in most cases do not mirror the views of the majority. CRT scholars use many different methods to garner the lived experiences of marginalized people. Counter-storytelling is a powerful and very effective method of recounting lived experiences; however, it is but one of many.

Tenet 3: Interest Convergence

Derrick Bell, a scholar of CRT, is noted for pioneering the idea of interest convergence, the third CRT tenet used for this study (Bell, 1980). Bell declared that the principle of interest convergence attends to the idea that “the interest of People of Color in achieving equality will be accommodated only when it converges with the interest of Whites” (p.523). In translation, Bell was saying that the advancement of marginalized groups is tolerated or supported only when Whites are able to benefit or do not experience a loss of any kind. The mere thought of having to relinquish power causes Whites to take a slow approach to racial progress. Milner (2008) found when describing interest convergence that power and interests are directly correlated.

Accused of being cynical, Bell (2003) often drew from historical experiences to illustrate how the interests of Whites were at the forefront of the decision-making process. When viewed through the lens of CRT, what once could have been mistaken for as a benefit to people of color

is seen for what it really was, interest convergence. Bell (2003) referred to interest convergence in the example of White and Black soldiers fighting together during the Second World War, only to come back to a segregated reality. Colleges and universities have been known to suspend admissions requirements to permit Black athletes to enroll for the purposes of increasing the numbers of minorities attending their institution. This type of interest convergence can be identified throughout the academy as decisions are made if and only if the privileged remain intact.

Criticisms of CRT

Since its debut on the education scene in 1995, CRT continues to evolve. Critical Race theorists and scholars are currently expressing concern about the direction in which CRT has grown. Literature has circulated that openly communicates disapproval of CRT's approach to storytelling (Kennedy, 1989). Kennedy questioned why the voices of people of color were considered to be more important than that of white people. Kennedy argued that someone's skin color does not necessarily provide them with a better stance on any given situation. Critics have also claimed that CRT does not consider sex or social class as a part of the framework because there is too much focus on race. Scholars of CRT have worked to address this concern in their analyzes and explanations of intersectionality of race with other social identities (Decuir & Dixon, 2004; Patton et al., 2007).

Chapter Summary

An analysis of relevant literature on Black administrators in higher education was provided here in Chapter II. Pertinent research was presented to examine the elements that influence the career progression of Black mid-level administrators into upper-level

administration. Additionally, job scope, depth, and satisfaction of mid-level administrators were discussed. Finally, the theoretical framework of CRT was used and interwoven into the discussion on career progression of Black mid-level administrators.

CHAPTER III: METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The purpose of the study was to examine the attitudes, beliefs, and perceptions of Black administrators in higher education regarding barriers to career advancement. The overarching research question for this study was: What are the attitudes and perspectives of Black administrators in higher education regarding barriers to the accessibility and attainment of executive-level leadership opportunities?

In most cases, a person's actions are shaped by their beliefs because their perceptions become their reality. The study aimed to detect the perceptions of barriers to Blacks' career progression beyond mid-level administration. Currently, literature on the topic of Black administrators and career advancement examines gender differences, salary disparities, and racial barriers. However, Black administrators' perceptions surrounding the topic have yet to be explored. If the intent is to eliminate career disparities between Blacks and Whites, decision makers need to be willing to examine the lived experiences of marginalized groups within the academy. Also, to get a deeper understanding of the factors that may play a role in stunting the career progression of Black administrators, special attention should be given to the voices of those who are directly impacted. Brown (2006) asserted that Q methodology is a valuable tool to study the voices of those who are marginalized. Q methodology was the primary tool used to capture and reveal the subjective opinions, beliefs, and attitudes of the participants in this study.

Since there is a significant dearth of literature in which Q methodology was used, a detailed explanation of this research design was deemed necessary. In this chapter, an overview

of the research design, research methodology, data collection and analysis techniques used in the study will be provided.

Theoretical Foundation of Q methodology

William Stephenson, a British physicist and psychologist, developed Q methodology in 1935 (Brown, 1993). When coupled with factor analysis, Q methodology provides a platform for systematically studying subjectivity (Brown, 2006). Q methodology has been used to scientifically study subjective viewpoints, opinions, beliefs, and attitudes of individuals (McKeown and Thomas, 1988). In other words, the subjective opinions of participants are the variables being studied in Q methodology.

Operating under the assumption that relevant perceptions exist for any given topic, this particular type of research method seeks input from those that who actually experienced any given phenomenon. Much like in an interview, the participant's point of view is sought and used to provide insight. However, participants often respond to interview questions with what they consider to be socially appropriate answers (Patton, 2002). Researchers find this to be a barrier when interviews are conducted in qualitative studies. Thus Q methodology was chosen as an alternate method of interviewing. According to Peritore (1989), in Q methodology the participant's integrity is respected, the results can be recorded anonymously, and the factorial results are not projected or predicted.

According to Brown (2006), Q methodology has a qualitative aspect which is recognized in the sorting stage. During this phase the participants are encouraged to sort statements about a specific topic based on how strongly they feel about what is being considered. As they sort, the participants have difficulty disguising their subjective opinions. Basically, the participants' beliefs emerge through the sorting process. In this regard, Q methodology functions as a

qualitative tool, but there is a quantitative aspect (Brown, 2006) that involves correlative and factor analysis of the completed Q sorts. This statistical aspect of Q methodology allows the researcher to group participants and search for identifiable patterns. Brown (1996) declared that Q methodology's mathematical substructure does not negate its purpose of revealing a person's or persons' point of view. Q methodology was chosen for this study because it allows for grouping and correlating the experiences of Black administrators in higher education and analyzing their response patterns.

Because it has both qualitative and quantitative components, Q methodology can be used to explore social discourses as they emerge in patterns of subjective views and attitudes (Addams and Proops, 2001). Q methodology is considered a mixed method research approach that utilizes factor analysis to analyze the opinions and subjective thoughts of a participant or group of participants on any given topic or subject matter. Brown (1996) described Q methodology as telling the story of life from the standpoint of the person living it, a story that would otherwise be overlooked during a standard quantitative study. This is one reason Q methodology is ideal for studying a marginalized group such as Blacks; no other group can provide an insight or understanding of how Blacks perceive any given phenomenon. Brown (2006) defined marginalization as the act of not taking others' values and beliefs into consideration, causing them to feel powerless, ignorant, insecure and devalued. The term "marginalized" has been used primarily to describe minority populations. "Marginalized" was used in this study to draw attention to the clear disparities that exist between the dominant group (Whites) and the minority (Blacks) in higher education.

Stephenson introduced Q methodology in 1935, but it was not received or respected as a true research methodology by practitioners and researchers until decades later. It took time for

the method to be recognized as a credible approach to research. Newman and Ramlo (2010) proposed that because Q methodology was introduced decades before the term “mixed methods” was coined, researchers did not recognize it as a credible method of research. At the time it was initially used, its relevance to research had not been realized. Q methodology was eventually viewed as a “methodology for the marginalized” (Brown, 2006). Q studies carried out on marginalized groups have been found to reduce the apprehension that accompanies participation in traditional research processes.

Brown (2006) labeled Q methodology as a misunderstood method of research; in fact, Brown claimed researchers commonly confused Q methodology with R-methodology. One of the more obvious differences between Q studies and R-studies is that R-methodology is objective in nature and Q methodology seeks out subjectivity. Maguire and Steelman (1999) suggested that R-methodology researchers are concerned with generalizing findings across a given population whereas proponents of Q methodology seek to understand the subjective viewpoints of individuals. It has become increasingly difficult to label Q methodology as either qualitative or quantitative, but that is irrelevant. Methodologies should be concerned with what is being produced and “what it brings to light” (McKeown & Thomas, 1988, p. 10). This study is interested in bringing to light the subjective viewpoints of Black administrators regarding leadership opportunities in higher education that would not be brought to light with other methodologies.

Research Question

The primary focus of the study was to explore the perceptions of Black mid-level administrators in Higher Education regarding the accessibility and attainment of executive-level leadership opportunities. The study was conducted to gain an understanding of how Black

administrators view their chances of advancing to executive-level administrative positions, and what variables are considered to be associated with whether or not a Black administrator advances. The following research question provided direction for the investigation:

What are the attitudes and perspectives of Black administrators in Higher Education regarding barriers to the accessibility and attainment of executive-level leadership opportunities?

Institutional Review Board Approval

This research study was approved by the Institutional Review Board of the University of North Florida before any of the research material could be disseminated. Documentation submitted for approval included the participant invitation (Appendix A), the participant invitation for the sorting process (Appendix B), the Informed Consent Agreements for study participation (Appendix C) and the Q sort (Appendix D), the Interview Protocol (Appendix E), and the Q sorting grid and instructions (Appendix F). A complete copy of the IRB approval letter is provided in Appendix G.

Participants

The person sample or P set is composed of the research participants who conduct the Q sort (McKeown & Thomas, 1988). By Q standards, a person sample of 30-50 participants is sufficient as the nature of the study determines the size (Brown, 1993; McKeown & Thomas 1988). Unlike R-methodology, small groups of people are sufficient when conducting studies using Q methodology; the researcher is interested in why their views are what they are rather than how many of them share the same views (McKeown & Thomas, 1988).

In this study the P set consisted of persons who participated sorting the Q sample. The P set for this study consisted of 40 participants. Of the 40 participants, 8 were invited to participate

in the interviewing portion of the study (Appendix A). The participants in the study were Black mid-level administrators holding one of the following titles: Director, Associate Director, Assistant Director, Assistant Dean, Associate Dean, Dean, and Manager. Each participant was employed by a bachelor's degree granting public college or university. An advanced degree (master's or doctorate) was a condition for participation. Convenience sampling was employed to identify the eight participants interviewed; however, snowball and other forms of purposive sampling were employed to identify the remaining participants to perform the Q sorts. Purposive sampling is typically used when subjects are selected based on some sort of characteristic (Patton, 1990). Due to a limited population, criterion sampling was employed to identify the maximum number of Black mid-level academic administrators in Florida. Invitations to participate in the study (Appendix B) were sent to 305 prospects throughout Florida. The prospects were identified by the classification specialists of the Human Resources departments of their respective institutions. For purposes of this study, only public institutions of higher education granting a bachelor's degree or higher in Florida were considered initially.

The Concourse

According to Brown (1993) in a Q study, the collection of communications surrounding a particular topic of interest is known as the concourse. In this case, Black administrators' career advancement was the topic of interest. The statements used in the concourse pertaining to Black administrators' career advancement were subjective in nature and were drawn from many different sources. Q methodology does not depend on factual statements for the formulation of the concourse (Brown, 2006). In fact, McKeown and Thomas (1988) stated that the concourse is nothing more than opinions on a given topic of interest. The concourse is developed using many different sources surrounding a topic of interest (Brown, 2006). The sources can run a full

gamut; different sources may share some commonalities, but will undoubtedly have nuances or distinctions that set them apart from each other. When multiple sources such as interviews, journals, magazines, books, newspapers, and any other communication surrounding a topic are being considered, a concourse can become rather large.

For this study, the concourse was formed primarily using statements taken from semi-structured interviews with eight Black mid-level administrators. Patton (2002) affirmed that interviews allow us to hear the “stories” or perspectives that are in someone’s mind (p. 341). In an effort to grasp an understanding of the lived experiences from those who live them, interviews were found to be the best method for this study. Brown (1993) indicated that interviews are an adequate and frequently used way of building a concourse. To facilitate transcription, voice recording devices were used. For precautionary purposes and to alleviate the risks of gaps or discrepancies, two audio recorders were used simultaneously during the interviews.

Concourse communications were also taken from relevant items gathered from the literature. Statements surrounding the topic were drawn from literature about Black administrators to supplement the statements taken from the interviews. The use of other sources was an attempt to diversify the sample of communication concourse. The final set of statements was identified as representative of the communication concourse surrounding the topic of Black administrators’ perceptions of career progression in higher education.

Concourse Interviews

To collect concourse communication, private interviews were conducted with eight Black mid-level administrators, selected as described above. Interviews can be structured, semi-structured, or unstructured (Fontana & Frey, 2005). Of the interviewing options available, a

structured interviewing style was found to be too rigid and unstructured interviews were too fluid. Semi-structured interviews were used for this study because the researcher preferred an exploratory and flexible interviewing style that would allow conversations to take place as warranted by the participant. The prearranged semi-structured questions used enable me to solicit as many views, perspectives, and ideas from the participants as possible. I was careful not to take over the session by asking leading questions based on preconceived ideas or biases. Every effort was made to follow the protocol as closely as possible. Flick (2002) stated that the protocol in semi-structured interviews should serve as a guide for building the interview while allowing the flexibility needed for the participant's full story to be uncovered.

Contact was made with each participant by telephone or email to schedule the interview. It would have been ideal for all of the interviews to be conducted in person, but scheduling conflicts presented challenges in some cases. Telephone interviews had to be scheduled and conducted for those who could not be available for an in person interview. Each interview lasted 30-60 minutes. Prior to the interview, each participant signed a consent form (Appendix C) affirming their participation in a study that was a part of a doctoral dissertation that had been approved by the University of North Florida Institutional Review Board (Appendix G). The participants were assigned a pseudonym to conceal their identity and so that the participants' statements could be traced by the researcher. The eight original colors of a box of crayons were used as the pseudonyms: Black, Blue, Brown, Green, Orange, Red, Violet, and Yellow.

Demographic information was gathered from the participants at the conclusion of their interview session (Appendix H). This was necessary because there were certain demographic requirements that had to be met for the data to be relevant to this particular study. The participants were also asked to list their education level, department, and years of experience

working in mid-level administration. The demographic information from each of the participants interviewed is provided in Table 2.

Table 2: Interview Participants' Demographic Information

ID	Gender	Highest Degree	Years at Current Institution	Years in an Admin Role	Department
Blue	Female	Master's	5-9 years	20+ years	Human Resources
Green	Male	Master's	5-9 years	Less than 5 years	Student Success
Red	Female	Specialist	5-9 years	5-9 years	Student Engagement
Orange	Female	Master's	Less than 5 years	5-9 years	Recruitment & Retention
Yellow	Female	Master's	5-9 years	15-19 years	Housing
Brown	Male	Master's	Less than 5 years	Less than 5 years	Financial Aid
Violet	Male	Doctorate	15-19 years	20+years	Financial Aid
Black	Male	Master's	10-14 years	20+ years	Records and Registration

Four female and 4 male participants were interviewed. In an attempt to diversify the concourse statements, the participants interviewed represented different areas across their institutions. The participants were asked to think about their experience as a black administrator in higher education and to respond to the following questions: "How do you self-identify racially?" "Do you feel comfortable expressing your perspective even if it is not popular?" "How did you decide to pursue a career in higher education?" "Are you interested in advancing from mid-level administration to upper-level administration?" "If so, what have you done to prepare yourself?" "What has had the greatest impact on your career mobility in higher education?" Do

you believe that you have an equal opportunity when pursuing future positions?” “Does your institution have any Black administrators in senior-level administrative positions?” “How do you feel about where you are right now in your career?” “Where does racism rank as a challenge to your career development?” “Would you recommend working in higher education to other Black professionals?” “In hindsight, what would you do differently if you were starting your career over today?” (Appendix E). The interviews were audio recorded using two devices and reviewed several times to transcribe and extract the statements. Themes began to emerge around the topic as the interview transcripts were being analyzed.

Concourse Refinement

The concourse for this Q study consisted of 90 statements. Sixty-five of the statements were generated from in-depth interviews and the remaining 25 were from the subject literature and demographic questionnaires. The full communication concourse can be viewed in Appendix I. The concourse is a cumulative collection of subjective viewpoints based on the topic of Black administrators’ career progression in higher education. The researcher reduced the concourse from 90 to 41 statements by eliminating statements that shared similar meaning or were unrelated to the topic. Three members of the dissertation committee assisted with the elimination process. Each of the dissertation committee members presented their own set of viewpoints as it related to the topic. One of the members was a Black female of Haitian decent. She was one of two Black faculty members working in her department. One of the members was a Black male, who had been recently promoted to the head the Physical Facilities department after several years as the Associate Director. The third member was the chair of my dissertation committee, and the chair of the doctoral program, and a White male. The three committee members brought different perspectives to the concourse refinement process.

Q Sample

The smaller group of statements extracted from the concourse is called the Q sample or Q set. McKeown and Thomas (1988) referred to the Q sample as the assembly of stimulus items that are extracted from the concourse. When sculpting the Q sample for this study, this researcher sought to create a sample that included the widest range of views surrounding this study's topic. However, it is important to note that all of the available communication about this topic could not be listed in the Q sample. McKeown and Thomas (1988) emphasized that Q samples are only representations of the communication texts that exist on a topic; they will not include all of the communications surrounding the topic. Q samples are designed to be subsets of the communications that exist about a topic; therefore, intentional strategic weeding out tactics should be employed when considering which items should be included and excluded from the concourse to form the Q sample.

By analogy with a population and sample size, in Q methodology, the concourse would be considered to be the population while the Q sample would be thought of as the sample of the population. McKeown and Thomas (1988) affirmed that Q samples are either "naturalistic," mirroring the views of the people that will be sorting the statements, or "ready-made," provided from other sources (p. 25). Since statements were taken from interviews for this study, they would be considered "naturalistic".

Both unstructured and structured sampling methods have been endorsed as viable ways of selecting items for the concourse (McKeown & Thomas, 1988). An unstructured Q sample is one in which "items presumed to be relevant to the topic at hand are chosen without undue effort made to ensure coverage of all possible sub-issues" or underlying factors (McKeown & Thomas, 1988, p. 28). On the other hand, a structured Q sample is based on prior theory, and is framed by

the researcher. To garner as much relevant communication as possible surrounding the topic, an “unstructured” Q sample was used. Of the original 90 statements only 41 were drawn from the concourse to formulate the Q sample (Appendix J).

Q Sort

In this step of the process, the statements in the Q sample are ranked by each participant in the order that aligns with each individual’s point of reference (Brown, 1993; McKeown & Thomas, 1988). The sorting process helps the participants tap into a deeper understanding of a certain topic of interest and prompts them to express views that they may not be aware they possess. Q methodology allows participants to assign meaning to their experience through the arrangement of statements (Brown, 1993).

An email confirming participation (Appendix A) along with the instructions and conditions for the Q sort were sent to all of the participants. The participants were provided with complete instructions on what the study would entail prior to completing the sort. The sort would not launch until the participant electronically signed the informed consent form (Appendix D). The researcher provided and distributed the Q sorting instructions and conditions (Appendix F) (McKeown & Thomas, 1988). The Q sort was done through the FlashQ website. The URL for this website was embedded in the email along with instructions for the sorting process. An automated email went out to the participants once a week for a period of one month reminding them to complete the sorting process. Email reminders ceased once the participant completed the sorting process or on the date of expiration.

The sorting process was led by the prompt: “Thinking about your experience as a Black administrator, what (barrier/challenge) do you perceive as being the greatest impediment to your career progression or advancement in higher education?” The participants were informed that

they would be representing their perspectives on career progression from mid-level to upper-level administration in higher education by ranking Q sample statements on a continuum from (-4), the statements that represent “Least Significant” challenges/barriers to your career progression in higher education, to (+4) “Most Significant” challenges/barriers to your career progression in higher education. Participants were asked to read all of the statements before separating them into categories and ranking them (Brown 1993, 1996; McKeown & Thomas, 1988). Once all of the statements were read, then the participants were asked to assign numbers to them ranging from (-4) to (+4).

Least Significant

Neutral/Unsure

Most Significant

[illegible]

Unlike the traditional Q sorting process where the Q sort is administered and facilitated by the researcher, the Flash Q software allowed the participants to control their own Q sorting process. Allowing the participants to conduct the Q sorting electronically allowed the participants to make selections without being led or influenced by the researcher. At the

conclusion of the sorting process, participants completed a post-sort questionnaire (Appendix K). Information was gathered from the questionnaire regarding the statements that were ranked on the extreme ends of the spectrum (+4) or (-4). The prompts and post-sort questions included:

1. From your experiences and perspective, what do you perceive to be the most significant challenges/barriers to your career progression or advancement in higher education?
2. Tell me about the statements you placed in the (+4) “MOST SIGNIFICANT” column. What do those statements mean to you?
3. Tell me about the statements you placed in the (-4) “LEAST SIGNIFICANT” column. What do those statements mean to you?

Data Analysis

The subjective points of view of each participant were presented in the organization of the sorted statements or Q sorts. In the analysis of the Q sorted statements, clusters of the participants’ opinions were identified and became the focus of analysis. The PQMethod 2.35 for Windows computer program was used to analyze the participants’ Q sorts (Schmolck & Atkinson, 2014). PQMethod was used because it readily supports key components of Q methodology studies such as correlation analysis, factor analysis, and factor rotation.

After each of the 40 participants completed the Q sorts, correlations between the participant’s rankings were calculated. Thus, a 40 X 40 correlation matrix was created. Demographic information was manually entered into PQM 2.35 (Appendix L), which utilizes a coding mechanism for assigning an identity to each participant (Schmolck & Atkinson, 2014). The formula used to assign a code for each participant is based on their demographic information. The factor analysis yielded the opinion groupings around a topic. According to

Brown (1993), the groupings are the emergent factors from the Q sorts that have distinctive commonalities. In Q methodology, people, rather than statements or traits, are the variables being correlated in the data analysis (McKeown & Thomas, 1988).

According to McKeown and Thomas (1988) the analysis of data in Q methodology involves the following statistical procedures: correlation, factor analysis, factor rotation, quantification of factor loadings, and factor interpretation. Each of the aforementioned procedures are used to ascertain the different Q sorts that may exist (Brown, 1993).

Correlation Matrix

Once the participants completed the sorting process, the raw data was entered into the software program PQMethod 2.35 (Schmlock & Atkinson, 2014). In data analysis, the first step was the calculation of correlations between the individual Q sorts. The correlation matrix output is provided in Appendix M.

Crowl (1993) stated that the correlation between two variables is determined by statistically calculating the degree of their relation. In Q methodology the focus is on correlating the participants' perspectives rather than traits or test items (Brown, 1993; McKeown & Thomas, 1988). The completed correlations formed a 40 X 40 correlation matrix. The values in the correlation matrix represent percentages; however, they are listed as whole numbers, so, for example, a "48" in the correlation matrix means a correlation of 0.48. The range for correlations between any variables extends from +1.00, which is a perfect positive correlation, to -1.00, a perfect negative correlation. Each sort yields 100% correlation with itself. When considering correlation for Q methodology, positive correlations represent the degree of agreement between participants' perspectives, and negative correlations represent the degree of disagreement between participants' perspectives on the sorted items. Correlations of 0.00 represent no

relationship between any pair of sorted items. Each Q sort reflects the viewpoint of a participant and the correlational coefficients reveal the commonalities that exist between the participants' perspectives (Brown, 1993). The raw data provided by the correlation matrix is used in the next step, factor analysis.

Factor Analysis

Factor analysis is used to identify the different groupings in the correlation matrix (Brown, 1996). According to Kline (1994) the main objective of factor analysis is to take the raw data and simplify it by condensing the matrix of correlations. This is the step in the Q methodology process where the number of factors is determined. The factors are based on Q sorts that are highly correlated with one another.

From the correlation matrix, PQMethod 2.35 clustered all of the sorts together to form non-rotated loadings (Schmolck & Atkinson, 2014). According to Brown (1993) the number of different groupings of viewpoints within the Q sorts are identified in factor analysis. Sorts that are highly related will cluster together causing a factor to emerge. Participants who think similarly will produce similar Q sorts which will cause them to end up on the same factor (Brown, 1980). Once the factor analysis was completed, the factors were interpreted based on information identified from the factor rotation and loadings.

Factor Rotation

The factor rotation is a statistical procedure that is designed to simplify the factor structure for the factor analysis and interpretation (Brown, 1996). Varimax rotation and hand rotation are the two distinct ways to rotate a factor in Q methodology. Of the two, the Varimax rotation was chosen because it is the mathematical method that maximizes the number of Q sorts on the factors that are extracted (Brown, 1980). Hand rotation relies on the researcher's

evaluation of what is considered to be the best way to rotate each factor (McKeown & Thomas, 1988). Once factor rotation has been completed, factor loadings and factor interpretation are done.

Factor Loadings

Factor analysis reveals how participants are grouped based on their Q sorts. In Q methodology the groups of participants that emerge during the factor analysis are the factors. The degree of agreement between each Q sort and the factor is represented by the factor loadings (McKeown & Thomas, 1988). Each participant's factor loading shows the amount of agreement between the Q sort of the individual and the total of Q sorts on that particular factor. The way to identify whether a participant shares opinions with others on a factor is if the participant has a positive (+) loading on a factor. Factor loadings are statistically significant ($p < .01$) if they are in excess of ± 2.58 times the standard error (SE). The following equation was used to calculate the Standard Error: $SE = 1/\sqrt{N}$ where N is the number of statements in the Q sample (McKeown & Thomas, 1988). This study had a $SE = .1561$. The factor loadings in excess of $\pm 2.58 (.1561)$, or $\pm .40$ were considered statistically significant.

Interpreting the Factors

Factors in Q methodology have to be interpreted; therefore, the researcher examines them to explore their differences and similarities. The interpretation of factors can be done after the correlation, factor analysis, factor rotation, and factor loading have all been completed. According to Brown (1980) the factors are interpreted assigning a factor score to the statements that describe each factor. The factor interpretation process takes into consideration the factor analysis and how the statements from the Q sample correspond with the actual factor scores. The factor scores quantify the degree of agreement and disagreement that exist with the point of view

represented by each Q sort of statements. The number of factors is based on how the statements are sorted by the participants and each factor illustrates a common point of view held by the participants. Participants with a noteworthy factor loading on a specific factor share a common point of view (McKeown & Thomas, 1988). Loadings that are positive represent an agreement with that factor's point of view and loadings that are negative represent a disagreement.

Validity and Reliability

In quantitative research, concepts of validity and reliability are relevant because they communicate to researchers that the phenomenon studied was measured correctly. Qualitative research focuses more on trustworthiness, dependability, and credibility. In Q methodology, validity and reliability are not as relevant because each person references themselves rather than any other person or population (Brown, 1980). Thus Q methodology is not concerned with generalizing the results to any population other than the participants who did the sorting. Brown (1980) asserts that there is no external measure for a person's self-reference; therefore, validity does not apply to Q sorts.

Q methodology reliability measures what happens when the same Q sort has been conducted by the same person. The person's viewpoints are measured to see to what degree they changed or stayed the same. This is a test-retest design and it does not say anything about the Q sort or the measurement scale. However, if desired, a researcher should be able to replicate the study using the documents included here as the interviews were audio recorded and transcribed. Detailed Q sort instructions, interview guidelines, and other pertinent information provided for the participants are included as well.

Chapter Summary

This study investigated the attitudes and perceptions of Black administrators in higher education regarding barriers to the attainability and accessibility of executive-level leadership opportunities. Q methodology was chosen as an appropriate research method because of its focus on subjectivity. Research on Black administrators in higher education has been conducted solely by objective means. The subjective views of Black administrators about their career progression needed to be added to the literature for the purpose of raising awareness. Interview information was presented in this chapter along with a complete overview of the methodology used for this study. The summarized theoretical foundations of Q methodology, the concourse, Q sample, P set, Q sort, data analysis, factor analysis, factor loading, and factor interpretation are also found in this chapter.

CHAPTER IV: RESEARCH FINDINGS

The purpose of this study was to understand the subjective manner in which Black administrators view possibilities of advancing beyond mid-level administrative positions within higher education. The opportunity to express their thoughts about career progression was afforded through completing an online 41 statement Q sort followed by a post-sort questionnaire. The 41 statements sorted referenced barriers to their career advancement. The research question that guided the study was:

What are the attitudes and perspectives of Black administrators in Higher Education regarding barriers to the accessibility and attainment of executive-level leadership opportunities?

To address the research question, Chapter IV presents a statistical analysis of the 40 Q sorts along with the qualitative analysis of data, data description, and data interpretation. This chapter presents the research findings in 10 sections: 1) Analysis of Data; 2) Correlation Matrix; 3) Factor Analysis; 4) Correlation Between Factors; 5) Factor Loadings; 6) Factor Rotations; 7) Factor Characteristics; 8) Factor Arrays; 9) Factor Narratives; and 10) Chapter Summary.

Analysis of Data

In Q Methodology, the analysis of data consists of data correlation, factor analysis, and the computation of factor scores (McKeown & Thomas, 1988). Therefore, each of the 40 sorts were correlated and factor analyzed, and factor scores were generated. The PQMethod 2.35 computer program was used to analyze the data (Schmolck & Atkinson, 2014). The statistical freeware program, PQMethod 2.35 was used because it was designed to adhere to the requirements of Q studies. According to Schmolck and Atkinson (2014) once the Q sort data

have been entered, PQMethod can systematically calculate the computations among Q sorts and perform a factor analysis.

Correlation Matrix

In Q Methodology, the relationships between Q sorts are examined (Brown, 1993). PQMethod calculates and generates a correlation matrix which displays how much or little each participant's sort has in common with all of the other participants' sorts. Principal component analysis was instrumental in building a correlation matrix to compare the different Q sorts. Since the construction of the matrix is based on the number of participants (N=40), for this study a 40X40 correlation matrix was generated (Appendix M). The correlation coefficients found within the matrix can range from -1.00 to +1.00. The degree of similarity between the sorts is shown by the correlation coefficients. A correlation coefficient of +1.00 is considered to be a perfect positive correlation while -1.00 is a perfect negative correlation (Brown, 1980). In the event two sorts have a correlation of +1.00, the sorts are considered to be in complete agreement. However, it is highly unlikely for two participants to sort all of their statements exactly the same. When two sorts have a correlation coefficient of -1.00, this means the sorts fall on the opposite end of the spectrum and their sorts are completely oppositional.

Factor Analysis

The next step in the data analysis process was to identify and analyze the factors. During the factor analysis phase, the correlation matrix was examined to explore the degree of agreement or disagreement between Q sorts (Watts & Stenner, 2012) and to determine the number of factors present. PQMethod 2.35 (Schmolck & Atkinson, 2014) was used to calculate the correlation matrix that depicted the level of agreement between participants' sorts and group the individuals based on how they sorted the statements. According to McKeown and

Thomas (1988), unlike in R-method studies, participants sorts are clustered. Each cluster was comprised of significant statements that described the different perspectives of the Black administrators who completed the sort. Brown (1980) stated if two participants shared the same perspective about a particular topic, then the two participants would sort similarly and end up on the same factor. As highly correlated sorts are clustered, a factor emerges.

When determining which factors were significant enough to select, eigenvalues were examined along with other criteria. PQMethod allows an 8-factor solution to be selected; however, this study did not warrant an 8-factor solution. Eigenvalues that exceed 1.00 are considered to be significant (McKeown & Thomas, 1988). Although all 8 unrotated eigenvalues exceeded 1.00, other criteria ruled out some of the factors as being significant. Brown (1980) suggested beginning the process by extracting seven factors, while Watts and Stenner (2012) suggested taking into account the number of participants when deciding on the number of factors to extract. As a starting point, Watts and Stenner (2012) suggested that a study with 12 or fewer Q sorts should consider extracting only two factors. In keeping with the suggestion of two factors for every 12 Q sorts, a 6-factor solution was examined, but the sixth factor was found to be too weak as there were several confounded sorts and few defining sorts loaded. Therefore, the sixth factor was not strong enough to retain (Brown, 1980). The next step was to examine the 5 factor solution. Although the fifth factor was found to be weaker than the first four factors, the 5 factor solution was found to have more stability than the six, seven, or eight factor solutions.

The 8 eigenvalues accounted for 61% of the variance. The eigenvalues for Factors 1-8 were as follows: Factor 1, 7.4726; Factor 2, 3.7522; Factor 3, 3.2569; Factor 4, 2.3567; Factor 5, 2.1557; Factor 6, 2.03567; Factor 7, 1.8840, and Factor 8, 1.7345. The 8 unrotated factor matrix

is provided in Appendix N. This matrix shows how each of the 40 participants loaded on each of the 8 unrotated factors.

Factor Rotation

Varimax rotation was deemed to be the best method for rotating and identifying the factors as they emerged. McKeown and Thomas (1988) stated that Varimax rotation presents a more precise view of the factors without the confusion that can be associated with individual Q sorts loadings. Once the Varimax rotation was completed, five factors were created with significant loadings. The five rotated factors represented 48% of the variance with factor one accounting for 13%, factor two 8%, factor three 12%, factor four 7%, and factor five 8%. The total explained variance shows the strength of the factors. Of the five factors, Factor 1 has the highest percentage of explained variance with .402 significance level. Thirty-one of 40 sorts were significantly loaded on one of the five factors and nine were nonsignificant because they did not load on any of the five factors. This means that nine participants were unable to describe their perspectives regarding career progression in higher education using any of the five factors' viewpoints. None of the participants loaded significantly on more than one factor; therefore, there were no confounding sorts. Whenever a participant has significantly loaded on multiple factors, the participant is said to have conflicting or multiple viewpoints. In Q studies, such multiple loadings are usually ignored when analyzing the data.

The sorts that loaded with a significance level of $p < .01$ were identified as the defining sorts for each factor. The defining sorts were highlighted in the five factor solution by the 8 participants who loaded on Factor 1, 4 who loaded on factor 2, 10 who loaded on Factor 3, 4 who loaded on factor 4 and 5 who loaded on factor 5. Sorts with a negative loading indicated that the participant strongly disagreed with the views of the factor. That is, the negative loading of

participant six (FLF34M) on factor two means that the views of factor two are strongly rejected by that participant.

Factor Loadings

McKeown and Thomas (1988) stated that factor loadings are correlation coefficients representing the relationship between any given sort and the factor. To measure how large a correlation should be in order to become statistically significant at the .01 level, the standard error must first be calculated. The following equation was used to calculate the Standard Error:

$SE = 1/\sqrt{N}$ where N is the number of statements in the Q sample (McKeown & Thomas, 1988).

For this study the Q sample included 41 statements; therefore, the $SE = 1/\sqrt{41}$ or $SE = .1561$.

- Loadings are statistically significant if they are calculated at 2.58 times the standard error (McKeown & Thomas, 1998). Using the formula, factor loadings in excess of 2.58 (.1561), or .4029 were considered statistically significant. A loaded sort surfaced whenever the significance level was at or above .4029 or at or below -.4029. Table 3 displays how the participants loaded on the five factors.

Table 3: Factor Loadings

Q Sort	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5
1 FLM47D	0.4788	0.1657	0.4716	0.0479	-0.4169
2 FLM48M	0.1194	0.2002	0.7365X	0.0158	-0.2505
3 FLF49D	0.2236	-0.1461	0.4675X	0.0777	0.0843
4 FLF36M	0.2485	0.2317	0.4436	0.2787	0.3144
5 FLF29M	-0.2650	0.2885	-0.1160	-0.0005	0.5562X
6 FLF34M	0.1833	-0.3832X	0.0269	0.1969	-0.0672
7 FLF47M	0.1215	0.0071	-0.1673	0.0087	0.6971X
8 FLM38O	0.0994	0.6210X	0.0807	0.0199	-0.0896
9 FLF37M	0.7527X	0.0405	0.2162	0.2551	0.0699
10 FLF34M	0.4232	0.0844	0.6544X	-0.0074	-0.1461
11 FLF39M	0.1274	0.1548	0.0388	0.1209	0.5273X
12 FLF33M	0.4325X	0.2525	0.2425	0.2245	0.0352
13 FLM49D	0.4363X	-0.0265	0.2781	-0.1447	0.0079

14	FLM36D	0.8629X	0.0926	0.0607	0.0129	-0.0238
15	FLF30M	0.0800	0.4799	0.6160X	-0.0600	0.0358
16	NCF37M	0.3882	0.1670	-0.0887	0.3224	-0.3392
17	VAM34O	0.3329	0.2918	-0.1571	0.4754	0.0846
18	FLM26M	0.5532X	0.0744	0.4707	-0.0600	-0.0243
19	VAF30M	-0.1025	0.2040	0.4189X	-0.2511	-0.0736
20	FLM39M	0.6678X	-0.1411	0.2625	0.0372	0.1772
21	TXF41M	-0.1124	0.5883X	0.2405	-0.1311	-0.2221
22	FLF42M	-0.0502	-0.0443	-0.2087	0.6506X	0.4813
23	FLF50S	-0.1559	0.7500X	-0.0739	0.1678	0.1918
24	FLF320	0.1561	0.2313	-0.0177	-0.1356	-0.5591X
25	FLF37Ma	-0.0772	-0.1573	0.0928	0.6394X	0.1661
26	FLF37Mb	-0.3498	0.1836	0.6088X	0.4111	0.1673
27	FLF37Mc	0.1333	0.1873	0.3324	-0.3769	0.2051
28	NCF32M	0.2385	0.2018	0.0144	-0.2173	0.3466
29	FLM34D	0.3109	-0.1301	0.6081X	-0.0888	0.1427
30	NCM48M	-0.0117	-0.1695	0.1780	-0.0426	0.4139X
31	FLF44D	0.7885X	-0.2557	0.0617	0.0316	-0.0184
32	FLM35M	0.2969	-0.1474	0.6408X	0.2955	-0.1159
33	FLM42D	0.3543	-0.2033	0.7093X	-0.0503	0.0451
34	FLF53M	0.0267	0.4098	0.0969	0.2173	0.4699
35	FLF56O	0.0859	0.0384	-0.0040	0.5301X	-0.1191
36	FLF46M	0.0393	0.0295	0.1393	0.3739X	0.0307
37	FLF39D	0.1427	0.3325	0.1468	0.2826	0.2356
38	TXF57D	0.2021	0.3704	-0.2833	-0.2203	0.3694
39	TXF32D	0.0551	0.3066	0.4174X	0.1326	0.0456
40	GAF42M	0.7380X	-0.0510	0.1512	0.0006	0.0055
% expl. Var.		13	8	12	7	8

Note. Factors loading > |.4029| (p<.01) are in boldface and X indicates a defining sort.

Correlations Between Factor Scores

The correlations of the five distinguishing factors are presented in Table 4. The highest correlation was found between factors 1 and 3 (.4313). The correlations between the sorts are generally low, which illustrates the factors represent distinct perceptions (Brown, 1993).

Although the five factors shared some commonalities, they were uniquely different from one another. Table 4 shows the correlations between factor scores.

Table 4: Correlations Between Factor Scores

Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5
----------	----------	----------	----------	----------

Factor 1	1.0000	-0.1142	0.4313	0.0238	-0.0193
Factor 2	-0.1142	1.0000	0.1131	-0.0072	0.0525
Factor 3	0.4313	0.1131	1.0000	0.0022	-0.0960
Factor 4	0.0238	-0.0072	0.0022	1.0000	0.3225
Factor 5	-0.0193	0.0525	-0.0960	0.3225	1.0000

Factor Characteristics

The factor characteristics data represents a clean report of details about each factor. The number of defining variables, the reliability coefficient, the composite reliability scores, and the standard error (SE) of factor scores for the five factors are presented. The factor characteristics can be found in Table 5.

The composite factor reliability is the strength of subjectivity over a period of time (Brown, 1980). McKeown and Thomas (1988) affirmed that reliability in Q methodology referred to the chances of a participant producing the same Q sort at different times or under two different administrators. Higher reliability scores indicate a favorable probability of a participant sorting the same under the same conditions (Watts and Stenner, 2012). The higher the reliability scores, the more inferences can be drawn from the stability of the factor. The following formula is used to calculate the reliability of a factor: $r = 0.80 / [1 + (p - 1) 0.80]$. In the equation p represents the number of participants being counted in a defining sort, and .80 is their estimated reliability coefficient (McKeown & Thomas, 1988). An increase in factor reliability results in a decrease in the error related to the factor. The decrease in error associated with a factor heightens confidence in a factor's level of distinctness. The composite reliability listed in Table 5 for the

factors ranges from 0.941-0.974. The high composite reliability coefficients indicate distinctive yet stable differences represented in the factor arrays.

Table 5: Factor Characteristics

Factors	1	2	3	4	5
No. of Defining Variables	8	4	10	4	5
Average Reliability Coefficient	0.800	0.800	0.800	0.800	0.800
Composite Reliability	0.970	0.941	0.976	0.941	0.952
SE of Factor Scores	0.174	0.243	0.156	0.243	0.218

Factor Scores

Factor scores are instrumental to Q methodology in that they heavily influence the interpretation phase of the study. The factor score is the z-score for a particular statement. The z-score measures the distance between the statement and the distribution's mean. The direction of the difference can also be determined by looking at the z-scores. According to McKeown and Thomas (1988), before the interpretation phase has begun, the factor scores are converted from z-scores to the whole numbers used in the sorting process. For the purpose of this study the whole numbers used were (-4 to +4). Once converted into whole numbers, it becomes much easier to compare data across factor arrays. Table 6 illustrates for factor 1 how z-scores are generated for each of the statements. Table 7 presents the factor arrays for each of the five factors. These tables are very helpful comparison tools, as they provide a bird's-eye view of how the statements were ranked for each factor.

Table 6: Normalized Factor Scores for Factor 1

No.	Statement	No.	Z-SCORES
10	I have not been able to develop strategic relationships with	10	1.869
18	I haven't found other people of color willing to assist or l	18	1.844
11	I don't feel my peers support me	11	1.672
29	I do not self-market and -promote like I should	29	1.589
32	I believe I am held to a higher standard as a person of colo	32	1.324
20	I do not see other people of color above, so I haven't sough	20	1.120
35	I have to compete with other minorities for positions open t	35	1.045
24	I do not have access to inner circles of leadership	24	0.850
23	I am not privy to hidden rules or curriculum of PWIs	23	0.755
25	I do not want to be labeled as a "token"	25	0.694
12	I am held back by the pressure to outperform high expectatio	12	0.632
27	Sometimes I wonder if my skin is thick enough for a PWI	27	0.499
39	It's been difficult for me to constantly code-switch in a PW	39	0.379
36	I have experienced systemic prejudices and racism	36	0.360
1	My college/university does not have a formal mentoring syste	1	0.341
33	There is a lack of commitment in my inst. toward diversity	33	0.324
9	I do not have a network of professionals outside my univer/c	9	0.298
30	I am often mistaken for being combative and aggressive unlik	30	0.262
14	The priorities of my coll/univer are constantly shifting	14	0.249
4	I have worked or am currently working for unstable orgs with	4	0.074
3	I am not willing to "sell out" or conform	3	0.022
37	I refuse to engage in office politics	37	-0.123
40	I think my age has held me back	40	-0.155
41	I work in a college/university that just doesn't understand	41	-0.183
19	I work or have worked for leaders who do not value employee	19	-0.216
5	My college/university is not progressive/forward thinking	5	-0.292
15	I have been unwilling or reluctant to relocate to advance	15	-0.314
31	I have not been in the right place at right time	31	-0.315
38	My advancement has been limited to diversity-related positio	38	-0.329
28	I have become too content in my current position	28	-0.340
6	It's a challenge for me to trust that feedback is constructi	6	-0.647
7	My reputation seems to be tainted and it precedes me	7	-0.737
16	I haven't been able to strike the right work/home balance	16	-0.783
17	I do not have social support outside work	17	-0.946
2	I am not able to communicate effectively due to cultural dif	2	-1.029
34	I am not a risk-taker and can be afraid of trying	34	-1.129
21	I have gotten to the point that I do not believe I will succ	21	-1.494
13	I haven't yet been able to acquire sufficient experience	13	-1.662
8	I am not yet sufficiently proficient in my role	8	-1.763
26	I have not shared my plans to advance with leadership so the	26	-1.808
22	I do not yet have the credentials or degrees I need	22	-1.935

Table 7: Factor Q Sort Values for Each Statement

No.	Statement	Factor Arrays				
		1	2	3	4	5
1	My college/university does not have a formal mentoring syste	1	0	2	4	0
2	I am not able to communicate effectively due to cultural dif	-2	-4	-1	-3	-1
3	I am not willing to "sell out" or conform	0	-2	3	3	-4
4	I have worked or am currently working for unstable orgs with	0	1	1	-3	-1
5	My college/university is not progressive/forward thinking	-1	3	2	2	2
6	It's a challenge for me to trust that feedback is constructi	-2	-1	-1	1	3
7	My reputation seems to be tainted and it precedes me	-2	-4	-4	-2	-3
8	I am not yet sufficiently proficient in my role	-4	1	-4	0	1
9	I do not have a network of professionals outside my univer/c	1	-3	1	2	1
10	I have not been able to develop strategic relationships with	4	-3	1	4	3
11	I don't feel my peers support me	4	1	-2	-1	1
12	I am held back by the pressure to outperform high expectatio	2	1	0	-1	-1
13	I haven't yet been able to acquire sufficient experience	-3	0	-2	4	-2
14	The priorities of my coll/univer are constantly shifting	0	2	1	2	2
15	I have been unwilling or reluctant to relocate to advance	-1	3	-3	1	4
16	I haven't been able to strike the right work/home balance	-2	4	-2	-1	0
17	I do not have social support outside work	-2	-2	-3	-1	0
18	I haven't found other people of color willing to assist or l	4	-1	0	0	-2
19	I work or have worked for leaders who do not value employee	-1	3	1	1	1
20	I do not see other people of color above, so I haven't sough	3	1	-4	0	0
21	I have gotten to the point that I do not believe I will succ	-3	-2	0	0	1
22	I do not yet have the credentials or degrees I need	-4	4	-1	-2	-1
23	I am not privy to hidden rules or curriculum of PWIs	2	-1	2	2	-3
24	I do not have access to inner circles of leadership	2	-1	4	1	0
25	I do not want to be labeled as a "token"	2	-1	3	-4	4
26	I have not shared my plans to advance with leadership so the	-4	4	-2	0	0
27	Sometimes I wonder if my skin is thick enough for a PWI	1	0	0	-2	1
28	I have become too content in my current position	-1	0	-1	0	2
29	I do not self-market and -promote like I should	3	0	0	2	2
30	I am often mistaken for being combative and aggressive unlik	0	-3	0	-3	-2
31	I have not been in the right place at right time	-1	0	-2	3	2
32	I believe I am held to a higher standard as a person of colo	3	1	4	-2	0

33	There is a lack of commitment in my inst. toward diversity	1	2	3	0	-4
34	I am not a risk-taker and can be afraid of trying	-3	-2	-3	1	3
35	I have to compete with other minorities for positions open t	2	2	1	1	-2
36	I have experienced systemic prejudices and racism	1	2	4	-4	-2
37	I refuse to engage in office politics	0	-2	2	3	4
38	My advancement has been limited to diversity-related positio	-1	0	0	-1	-4
39	It's been difficult for me to constantly code-switch in a PW	1	-4	-1	-1	-1
40	I think my age has held me back	0	-1	-1	-4	-1
41	I work in a college/university that just doesn't understand	0	2	2	-2	-3

Factor Interpretation

Once the Q sorts were entered into PQMethod 2.35 (Schmolck & Atkinson, 2014), the emergent factors were analyzed. In this study, five emergent factors represented five different perspectives held by the administrators who participated in the study. Themes were revealed that set each factor apart from the others in the study. To get a better understanding of each factor, factor arrays, distinguishing statements, and post-sort questionnaire comments regarding the +4 (Most Significant) and -4 (Less Significant) sorts were analyzed.

In analyzing each factor, distinguishing statements were considered to help define the perspectives. Of the 41 statements presented throughout the study, the distinguishing statements were the statements that were ranked or viewed significantly differently from factor to factor. For example, statement #6 is a distinguishing statement of Factor 5 because it ranks higher in the Factor 5 array at +3 than in any of the other factor arrays (See Table 21). Integrating the distinguishing statements into the interpretation allowed for the identification of important items that set one factor apart from another. This qualitative approach to the data was also taken to assign meaning to the perceptions, beliefs, and attitudes of the participants.

Each factor was given a descriptive title based on the themes that emerged from the examination of the factor arrays, distinguishing statements, and post-sort statements. If a statement was found to have a high factor array score and was identified as a distinguishing statement, it became an intricate part of the description building process for that factor. For example, in Factor 5, Statement #34 “I am not a risk taker and can be afraid of trying” was both a highly ranked score, with a ranking of (+3), and a distinguishing statement, with a z-score of 1.21. The fact that Statement #34 ranked higher in Factor 5 than it did in any of the factors shows that there is something unique about this statement as it pertains to this particular factor.

Statements like this were used as models for developing a deeper understanding of the emergent themes for each factor. Tables 10, 13, 16, 19, and 22 list the distinguishing statements for each factor.

The analysis and examination of the five emergent factors that represent how Black administrators in higher education perceive career progression led to the development of the names that were assigned to each of the factors. The five factors that were interpreted were named: (1) Factor 1: *The Disconnected*, (2) Factor 2: *The Disadvantaged*, (3) Factor 3: *The Disrespected*, (4) Factor 4: *The Dismissed*, and (5) Factor 5: *The Disinterested*. The names were carefully assigned based on the interpretations and descriptions of each factor which included the demographic information for each participant. Each factor name began with the prefix “dis” added to five root words to change their meanings to represent lacking in a certain area. For example, *The Disconnected* group of participants were not connected; therefore, they lacked connection to people of influence. Each factor’s name was assigned based on the themes that emerged during the interpretation phase. Factor arrays, distinguishing statements and post-sort statements were instrumental in forming the descriptions for each factor.

The question asked of participants while conducting the sort was, “What (barrier/challenge) do you perceive as being the greatest impediment to your career progression or advancement in higher education?”

Factor 1: The Disconnected

In this study, Factor 1 accounted for 13% of the explained variance. Eight of the 40 sorts defined Factor 1. Participants 9, 12, 13, 14, 18, 20, 31, and 40 (Table 3) loaded onto the perspective represented in Factor 1. Four were female and four were male, ranging in age from 26-49. Of the eight administrators who comprised Factor 1, 7 were residents of Florida while

one of them lived in Georgia. Only three of the participants who loaded on Factor 1 were engaged in some sort of mentoring relationship; however, they all had some sort of professional affiliation. Three of the administrators held doctoral degrees, while the remaining five held master's degrees. All degrees were obtained from a PWI with the exception of one undergraduate degree received from an HBCU. The number of years working for their current institution were listed as: 3 worked <5 years, 2 worked 5-9 years, 2 worked 10-14 years, and 1 worked > 20 years. All of the participants who loaded on Factor 1 had been working in an administrative level position for at least 5 years with 3 having 5-9 years, 2 having 10-14 years, 2 having 15-19 years, and 1 having >20 years of experience. The areas in higher education represented in Factor 1 varied with 1 working in Academic Affairs, 3 working in Administrative Affairs, 1 in Enrollment Services, and 3 in Student Affairs. Table 8 summarizes this data.

Table 8: Demographic Characteristics of Participants Loading on Factor 1

Participant	State	Sex	Age	Education	Mentoring	Prof. Affiliations	Undergrad Institution	Master's Institution	Doctoral Institution	Yrs. w/ Inst.	Total Yrs. Admin.	Category of Position
9	FL	Female	37	Master's	No	Yes	PWI	PWI	-	10-14	10-14	Student Affairs
12	FL	Female	33	Master's	Yes	Yes	PWI	PWI	-	<5	5-9	Student Affairs
13	FL	Male	49	Doctoral	Yes	Yes	HBCU	PWI	PWI	< 5	20+	Admin. Affairs
14	FL	Male	36	Doctoral	No	Yes	PWI	PWI	PWI	5-9	5-9	Admin. Affairs
18	FL	Male	26	Master's	Yes	Yes	PWI	PWI	-	<5	5-9	Enroll Services
20	FL	Male	39	Master's	No	Yes	PWI	PWI	-	5-9	10-14	Student Affairs
31	FL	Female	44	Doctoral	No	Yes	PWI	PWI	PWI	20+	15-19	Admin Affairs
40	GA	Female	42	Master's	No	Yes	PWI	PWI	-	10-14	15-19	Academic Affairs

Factor arrays, post-sort comments and distinguishing statements all offered some insight or explanation as to how the participants felt about career progression in higher education. Participants within Factor 1 assigned high levels of significance by ranking the following statements as +4 and +3 (most significant) or -4 and -3 (least significant)

Table 9: Highest Factor Scores - Factor 1

No	Statement	Factor 1	
		Rank	Z-Score
10	I have not been able to develop strategic relationships with people who can help me advance my career.	+4	1.869
*18	I haven't found other people of color in my college/university who are willing to assist me or look out for my best interests.	+4	1.844
*11	I don't feel my peers support me.	+4	1.672
*29	I do not practice self-market and self-promote like I should.	+3	1.589
32	I am held to a higher standard as a person of color	+3	1.324
*20	I do not see other people of color in the higher administrative levels so I haven't sought advancement opportunities for fear of not "fitting in."	+3	1.120
34	I am not a risk taker and can be afraid of trying.	-3	-1.129
*21	I have gotten to the point where I do not believe I will succeed in my efforts to advance.	-3	-1.494
*13	I have not yet been able to acquire sufficient experience.	-3	-1.662
8	I am not yet sufficiently proficient in my current role.	-4	-1.763
*26	I have not shared my plans to advance with leadership; therefore, they are unaware of my aspirations.	-4	-1.808
*22	I do not yet have the credentials or degree to be successful.	-4	-1.935

Note: *represents distinguishing items

In Factor 1, a significant emphasis was placed on being "connected" to a solid network of influential professionals. This group of higher education administrators believed they had taken

all of the necessary steps to advance with the exception of connecting with a network of people who could support or encourage their career progression toward upper level leadership. The lack of connection to the right people of influence has been a challenge and has operated in direct opposition to them achieving their career goals. This group of administrators did not consider themselves to be a part of the “inner circle” of significant people. They considered themselves to be equipped with the tools necessary to excel, if given the opportunity. However, not being connected with the right people has worked directly against their being considered for upper level leadership roles. Item #18, “I have not found other people of color in my college/university who are willing to assist me or look out for my best interests,” was ranked +4. This suggested a concern for the inability to relate to other people of color who are willing to assist with the planning of career goals and objectives. Not only is there a lack of “color” in leadership positions willing to help them advance, but they have been unable to strategically secure a rapport with anyone in a leadership position who could help them progress to the next level (#10, +4). Next to their inability to gain a strategic relationship with anyone of influence, there is also a lack of peer support (#11, +4), *“It has been noted on several occasions that my peers have rooted for me to fail, especially if I am getting too much attention from upper management”* (Participant #40). Due to low levels of support, they do not see benefit in self-marketing and promoting themselves (#29, +3), *“I can honestly say my lack of self-promotion has contributed to where I am in my career”* (Participant #14). The data suggested that this group of administrators deliberately refrain from seeking advancement opportunities because there are no other people of color in the higher level positions they are able to relate to (#20, +3). The things that could be controlled by the participants, such as acquiring solid educational and professional experiences, were not considered to be barriers or challenges to their career progression.

Although this group of administrators do not readily “toot their own horns,” they have done their due diligence by making leadership aware of their goals and aspirations (#26, -4) and they have prepared themselves, as they have the credentials and experience to be successful (#22, -4; #13, -3). However, *“there just aren’t the right people in the right places to promote people of color to the executive level of leadership”* (Participant #31). This group of administrators recognizes that they must exceed expectations because they are held to a higher standard than their White counterparts (#32, +3), but in spite of adversity they will continue to pursue career advancement (#21, -3) and take on the associated added risks (#34, -3).

Some of the post-sort comments provided a deeper insight into the reasons why many of the items were sorted as they were. Participant #14 loaded the highest on Factor 1 with .8629. The attainment of a doctoral degree, involvement with a professional affiliation, and 5-9 years of administrative level experience showed that this 36-year-old male had invested in himself and possessed the credentials required to advance to the upper levels of leadership in higher education (#22, -4). Although he openly admitted that he does not self-market or promote himself as much as he should (#29, +4), he identified the absence of a strong networking presence as one of the barriers that has impeded his career progression. From his sorting pattern, I gathered that he had been unable to create strategic relationships with people who are in positions to help advance his career. He has also been unsuccessful in finding people of color willing to assist his career advancement (#10, +4; #18, +4). He referenced his network as being small and *“even smaller when considering the number of Black people who could positively influence my career progression”*. This participant’s views on networking were revealed through his comment regarding statement #10:

It is my firm belief that your “net worth” is set by your “network”. I have not been in a position to establish beneficial relationships with people who are willing to mentor me or assist me in getting to the next level.

Participant #9 stated that she ranked #11 highly because of past experiences with being publicly rewarded in front of peers. Participant #9 stated:

Each time I am elevated in front of my peers, I feel as if I am targeted simply because they don’t want to see me advance.

She also ranked #10 a +4. She feels the lack of assistance provided through organizational mentoring programs had left her to fend for herself without any guidance or support. She shared thoughts as to why she ranked #10 so highly:

Since there are no mentoring programs in place, I am left trying to find like-minded professionals that can help to advance my career and possibly take me on as a mentee.

Participant #31, a 44-year-old female with a doctoral degree, was the 2nd highest loading participant on Factor 1. She stated that she ranked #18 with a +4 because of the lack of help and support she has been able to receive from other Blacks. She stated:

There are very few people of color or Blacks operating in a position that could actually help me to advance to the next level. Those that are in those types of positions are not mingling with mid-level administrators or at least they are not fraternizing with me.

She continued and shared her thoughts as to why she ranked #22 a -4 and deemed it least significant to her point of view regarding barriers and challenges that have impeded her career progression:

I have several certifications and have earned two Master’s Degrees and a Doctorate since being employed at this institution. Granted, I just received my PhD last fall. However,

even before receiving my degree, I had what was required to progress to the next level. I just do not have the right people in the right places who are willing to promote me to the executive level of leadership.

Participant #18 ranked statement #13 as -4. The 26-year-old male has secured a mentor and joined a professional affiliation within the five years or less he has been with his current institution. He presented himself as being focused and determined. He shared his perspective on statement #13:

I feel I have been able to gain significant experience in my role. However, I had to be proactive about it and constantly ask if I could participate in trainings or travel to professional development workshops. These opportunities are never suggested or offered to me. I had to seek them out myself.

The distinctiveness of the factors is communicated through the distinguishing statements. It becomes apparent what makes each factor unique once a comparison of the distinguishing statements for each factor has been analyzed. Fourteen statements were identified as “distinguishing” statements for Factor 1 (Table 10).

Table 10: Distinguishing Statements for Factor 1

No.	Statement	RNK	SCORE
18	I haven't found other people of color in my college/university who are willing to assist me or look out for my best interests.	+4	1.84*
11	I don't feel my peers support me.	+4	1.67*
29	I do not self-market and self-promote like I should.	+3	1.59*
20	I do not see other people of color in the higher administrative levels so I haven't sought advancement opportunities for fear of not “fitting in.”	+3	1.12*
25	I do not want to be labeled as a “token.”	+2	0.69*

39	It's been difficult for me to constantly "code switch" in a predominantly white work environment.	+1	0.38*
3	I am not willing to "sell-out" or conform.	0	0.02*
19	I work (or have worked) for leaders who do not value their employees' career advancement.	-1	-0.22
5	My college/university is not progressive or forward thinking.	-1	-0.29*
15	I have been unwilling or reluctant to relocate in order to advance professionally.	-1	-0.31*
21	I have gotten to the point where I do not believe I will succeed in my efforts to advance.	-3	-1.49
13	I have not yet been able to acquire sufficient experience.	-3	-1.66*
26	I have not shared my plans to advance with leadership; therefore, they are unaware of my aspirations.	-4	-1.81*
22	I do not yet have the credentials or degree to be successful.	-4	-1.94*

*Indicates significance at $P < .01$

The participants who loaded on Factor 1 were concerned with the lack of contacts or connects they have been able to secure thus far. The items listed as most significant to Factor 1 were centered on the participants' inability to develop beneficial professional relationships. There was a concern for the limited presence of Black administrators in higher levels of administration willing to assist in career development. This group did not feel strongly about sharing their career goals or promoting what they have done out of fear that they will not be received well by their peers. They felt their peers were rooting against them and did not support their endeavors. This group was often discouraged from seeking leadership opportunities due to the fear of not "fitting in" to a culture where there were no other people of color. Although the participants loading on this factor possess the credentials/degrees, work experience, and desire to progress they just are not connected to the right people to make it happen.

Factor 2: The Disadvantaged

Factor 2 accounted for 8% of the explained variance. Four of 40 participants (6, 8, 21, and 23) loaded onto Factor 2. Three females and one male ranging in age from 34-50 loaded on Factor 2. Three of them were from Florida and one was a Texas resident. All of the participants who loaded on Factor 2 had been a part of some sort of mentoring partnership and had a professional affiliation. Two participants earned their undergraduate degrees from HBCUs; the other two undergraduate degrees and all four of the master's degrees were received from PWIs. Factor 2 is the only one of the five factors in which all participants reported less than five years of experience in their current institution. However, two of the participants reported 5-9 years of experience in administrative level positions and the other two reported 10-14 years. The areas in higher education represented in Factor 2 were as follows: 1 from Academic Affairs, 2 from Administrative Affairs, and 1 from Enrollment Services (Table 11).

Table 11: Demographic Characteristics of Participants Loading on Factor 2

Participant	State	Sex	Age	Education	Mentoring	Prof. Affiliation s	Undergrad Institution	Master's Institution	Doctoral Institution	Yrs. w/ Inst.	Total Yrs. Admin.	Category of Position
6	FL	Female	34	Master's	Yes	Yes	PWI	PWI	-	<5	10-14	Enroll Services
8	FL	Male	38	Other	Yes	Yes	HBCU	PWI	-	<5	10-14	Admin Affairs
21	TX	Female	41	Master's	Yes	Yes	PWI	PWI	-	< 5	5-9	Admin. Affairs
23	FL	Female	50	Ed. Spec.	Yes	Yes	HBCU	PWI	-	<5	5-9	Academic Affairs

Table 12 shows the items participants identified in Factor 2 as most significant by ranking them either +4 and +3 (Most Significant) or -4 and -3 (Least Significant).

Table 12: Highest Factor Scores-Factor 2

No.	Statement	Factor 2	
		Rank	Z-Scores
*22	I do not yet have the credentials or degree to be successful.	+4	1.886
*16	I haven't been able to strike the right work/home balance.	+4	1.526
*26	I have not shared my plans to advance with leadership; therefore, they are unaware of my aspirations.	+4	1.469
5	My college/university is not progressive or forward thinking.	+3	1.436
15	I have been unwilling or reluctant to relocate in order to advance professionally.	+3	1.423
*19	I work (or have worked) for leaders who do not value their employees' career advancement.	+3	1.358
*10	I have not been able to develop strategic relationships with people who can help me advance my career.	-3	-1.097
*9	I do not have a network of professionals outside my own university/college.	-3	-1.389
30	I am often mistaken for being combative and aggressive, whereas White colleagues are perceived as being passionate.	-3	-1.525
*39	It's been difficult for me to constantly "code switch" in a predominantly White work environment.	-4	-1.590
2	I am not able to communicate effectively due to cultural differences.	-4	-1.628
7	My reputation seems to be tainted and it precedes me.	-4	-1.693

Note: *represents distinguishing items.

Participants represented in Factor 2 considered their circumstances to be barriers to their career progression in higher education. Unlike the participants in Factor 1, this group had all the

right connections in place but did not feel they had the experience and education required to advance to the next level. The absence of solid work/home balance coupled with the lack of credentials and degrees have contributed to the stunted career growth and development of this group of participants (#16, +4; #22, +4). They were less motivated to extend themselves for advancement opportunities because they did not feel they met all of the necessary requirements or qualifications. They were not in a position to entertain the idea of relocating for the purposes of advancing (#15, 3). For example, *“relocation is not an option due to the fact I do not personally wish to live in another geographic area because I enjoy my current city and state of residence”* (Participant #23). They did not feel leadership values their career paths to advancement and their institutions have not proven to be progressive or forward thinking (#19, +3; #5, +3). These challenges were perceived as reasons why they did not communicate advancement plans with leadership (#26, +4). For example, *“I have found when you are trying to work your plan, the less people that know it, the better”* (Participant #8). The participants who loaded on this factor were able to communicate effectively across cultural lines (#2, -4), they were well liked as their reputation had not been tarnished (#7, -4), and they felt they were perceived to be passionate like their White counterparts and not aggressive or combative (#30, -3).

Participants who loaded on Factor 2 perceived themselves to be well connected with a network of professionals outside of their own institution (#9, -3): *“I actually have a strong network of Black professionals in higher education”* (Participant #23). This group had also been successful in developing strategic relationships with people who would be able to help them to advance their careers (#10, -3). They were also much more socially focused than the administrators who loaded on Factor 1. One of the most pronounced attributes in Factor 2 was

their ability to obtain and maintain connections with others of influence through social interaction. It is evident that this group places all of their stock in their ability to make friends or develop relationships with associates. Statement #13, a distinguishing statement that identifies the level of significance placed on work experience, ranked at (0) with a .02 z-score. The participants were unsure or neutral on the idea of sufficient work experience being a barrier for them. The idea that professional affiliations would supersede or trump the experience required to advance spoke volumes about Factor 2. Statements #39, #9 and #10 were also distinguishing statements with negative high factor rankings (-4, -3, and -3). Each of the statements referred to the participants' ability to secure both Black and White professional connections inside and outside of their institutions. Their exposure to the inner circles of leadership had heightened their level of confidence with having to "code switch" while in a predominantly white environment. Statement #39 (about "code switching") had its highest z-score (1.59) and factor ranking (-4) in Factor 2 compared to any of the other factors. This indicated that this statement was a major part of the themes emerging for the factor.

Participant #23, at the age of 50, was the oldest person to load on Factor 2. She also loaded the highest on Factor 2 at .750. She placed #30 at -4. She spoke of the importance of remaining composed and professional at all time to remove the possibilities of being labeled as aggressive and combative:

I am well-versed and well-skilled in being professional, keen and tactful. I know how to address issues in a way that invites broader understanding, collaboration and partnership that invokes greater learning. People will not listen to you or respect you when you come from a place of anger or emotion.

Participant #23 also explained why she ranked #2 high:

I have few problems navigating a predominantly White environment. I code switch very easily and feel comfortable conversing and working in those arenas because I attended mostly white schools, except in grades 1-6 and as an undergraduate student. From age 13 and up, I lived in predominantly black environments and predominantly white environments very easily.

Additionally, participant #21, a 41-year-old Texan, shared her thoughts about ranking #19:

In my previous role, I worked for a manager that had no interest in supporting diversity and inclusion. This resulted in my desire to leave that role, and I am in an entirely different situation now where the manager (who is of color) is interested in my career progression.

Participant #21 recognized her limitations as she ranked both #22 and #15 high. She provided an explanation for them both and indicated how her situation limited her from being able to advance to the next level in her career. Her explanation for #15 provides some insight as to why she might not be as mobile as she would like for the purposes of seeking advancement opportunities:

I do not have my PhD yet which I think will seriously limit me. I have plateaued in my career at this point without it. (#22)

I am divorced and have children that are required to be near their father, so it limits my ability to move around. Otherwise I would be more open to opportunities in different places. (#15)

Participant #8, the only male to load on Factor 2, explained why he ranked #10 at -4:

Sometimes people in positions of great organizational influence are guarded by others. They do not want to allow or relinquish access.

Participant #30 explained why she ranked #30 at +4. Her explanation provided some insight into how Black women in leadership positions feel when their passion is mistaken for having an attitude. She stated,

My feedback is too easily dismissed as “having an attitude” which is contrary to my personality but in line with stereotypes of black women.

Factor 2 was comprised of 11 distinguishing statements, of which 5 were positive. The distinguishing statements for Factor 2 are listed in Table 13.

Table 13: Distinguishing Statements for Factor 2

No.	Statement	RNK	SCORE
22	I do not yet have the credentials or degree to be successful.	+4	1.89*
16	I haven't been able to strike the right work-home balance.	+4	1.53*
26	I have not shared my plans to advance with leadership; therefore, they are unaware of my aspirations.	+4	1.47*
19	I work (or have worked) for leaders who do not value their employees' career advancement.	+3	1.36*
13	I haven't yet been able to acquire sufficient experience.	0	0.02
25	I do not want to be labeled as a “token”.	-1	-0.70*
21	I have gotten to the point where I do not believe I will succeed in my efforts to advance.	-2	-0.83
3	I am not willing to “sell-out” or conform.	-2	-1.00*
10	I have not been able to develop strategic relationships with people who can help me advance my career.	-3	-1.10*
9	I do not have a network of professionals outside of my own university/college.	-3	-1.39*
39	It's been difficult for me to constantly “code switch” in a predominantly white work environment.	-4	-1.59*

*Indicates significance at $P < .01$

Having a solid networking system did not seem to be of concern for the participants who loaded on Factor 2. In fact, this group of participants appeared to be well connected and advantaged in the areas of networking and relationship building. Therefore, the perspective in Factor 2 was different from Factor 1, in that this group appeared to be winning in the social category. They also seem to be solid in other areas that would cause one to assume that they are considered to be model employees and team players. For example, having a tainted reputation and being labeled as aggressive were of little concern to Factor 2 participants. This group did not have a problem securing professional connections inside as well as outside the institution. The inability to communicate across cultures effectively was not a concern to this group. In fact, communication seemed to be this group's strong point. The ability to code-switch to fit into a predominantly White environment, for Factor 2, was not identified as a challenge or barrier. It was noted in one of the comments that code switching was not difficult and that they are *"pretty good at code switching and compartmentalizing...since attending a PWI in undergrad, it was learned at a very young age"* (Participant #21).

The participants who loaded on Factor 2 seemed to have the right formula pieced together to develop a solid networking and support system; however, they did not meet the qualifications to get to the next level of leadership. They have refrained from sharing their ideas or plans for advancement because they feel it is moot. In a sense, this group of participants have disqualified themselves because they are unwilling to relocate for career opportunities, they lack the credentials needed, and they have not been able to strike the right work/home balance. Since they do not feel they work for institutions who value diversity enough to accommodate employees with similar situations, this group of participants does not see the importance of

sharing any of their professional plans and goals with leadership. Their personal situations have placed them at a disadvantage.

Factor 3: The Disrespected

Factor 3 was defined by 10 sorts, the largest group to load on any of the five factors. Twenty-five percent of the participants loaded on Factor 3 and it accounted for 12% of the explained variance. Of 40 participants, the 10 who loaded onto the perspective represented in Factor 3 were participants 2, 3, 10, 15, 19, 26, 29, 32, 33, and 39. Four males and 6 females loaded on Factor 3. The participants from Factor 3 ranged in age from 30 to 52. Of the 10 administrators who comprised Factor 3, 8 were residents of Florida and the other two were from Virginia and Texas. Three of them had secured a mentor at some point in their careers, while 7 were involved in a professional affiliation. Six of the participants had earned a master's degree, and the remaining four participants held doctoral degrees. Two undergraduate degrees, two master's degrees, and one doctoral degree were earned from an HBCU. All of the others were earned at a PWI. The number of years working for their current institution were listed as: 6 participants worked < 5 years and 4 participants worked 5-9 years. The number of years working in an administrative level position were listed as: 3 participants < 5 years, 4 participants 5-9 years, 2 participants 10-14, and 1 participant 15-19 years. The areas in higher education represented in Factor 3 were: 2 working in Academic Affairs, 3 working in Administrative Affairs, 1 working in Enrollment Services, and 4 working in Student Affairs. The demographic data for this factor is listed in Table 14.

Table 14: Demographic Characteristics of Participants on Factor 3

Participant	State	Sex	Age	Education	Mentoring	Prof. Affiliations	Undergrad Institution	Master's Institution	Doctoral Institution	Yrs. w/ Inst.	Total Yrs. Admin.	Category of Position
2	FL	Male	48	Master's	No	Yes	HBCU	HBCU	-	<5	< 5	Student Affairs
3	FL	Female	49	Doctoral	No	No	PWI	PWI	PWI	5-9	15-19	Admin. Affairs
10	FL	Female	34	Master's	No	Yes	PWI	PWI	-	< 5	5-9	Student Affairs
15	FL	Female	30	Master's	Yes	Yes	PWI	PWI	-	< 5	5-9	Academic Affairs
19	VA	Female	30	Master's	Yes	No	PWI	PWI	-	5-9	<5	Enroll Services
26	FL	Female	37	Master's	No	No	PWI	PWI	-	< 5	10-14	Student Affairs
29	FL	Male	34	Doctoral	No	Yes	PWI	HBCU	HBCU	5-9	5-9	Student Affairs
32	FL	Male	35	Master's	No	Yes	PWI	PWI	-	< 5	< 5	Admin. Affairs
33	FL	Male	42	Doctoral	Yes	Yes	HBCU	PWI	PWI	5-9	10-14	Academic Affairs
39	TX	Female	52	Doctoral	No	Yes	PWI	PWI	PWI	< 5	5-9	Admin. Affairs

The participants who loaded on Factor 3 viewed the following statements, found in Table 15, as most significant by ranking them with either +4 and +3 (Most Significant) or -4 and -3 (Least Significant).

Table 15: Highest Factor Scores-Factor 3

No.	Statement	Factor 3	
		Rank	Z-Scores
*24	I simply do not have access to the inner circles of leadership in my predominantly White institution.	+4	1.808
*36	I have experienced systemic prejudices and racism.	+4	1.785
32	I am held to a higher standard as a person of color.	+4	1.648
25	I do not want to be labeled as a “token”.	+3	1.414
33	There is a lack of commitment to diversity in my institution.	+3	1.339
3	I am not willing to “sell-out” or conform.	+3	1.177
17	I do not have social support outside of work.	-3	-1.044
*15	I have been unwilling or reluctant to relocate in order to advance professionally.	-3	-1.219
34	I am not a risk taker and can be afraid of trying.	-3	-1.276
*20	I do not see other people of color in the higher administrative levels so I haven’t sought advancement opportunities for fear of not “fitting in”.	-4	-1.585
8	I am not yet sufficiently proficient in my current role.	-4	-1.714
7	My reputation seems to be tainted and it precedes me.	-4	-1.785

Note: *represents distinguishing items.

The participants who loaded on Factor 3 perceived their career progression to be impeded by racist and discriminatory practices. This group of participants have been victims of microaggressions, which they feel have directly impacted their career progression. Much like

those who loaded on Factor 1, this group of participants feel they are held to a higher standard as a person of color in comparison to their White counterparts (#32, +4). Participants loading on Factor 3 also felt they were not granted access to the inner circles of leadership (#24, +4). Although lack of access was identified as one of the barriers this group experienced, the fact that they were the only group to report they have experienced systemic prejudice and racism caused them to be viewed through a completely different lens than Factor 1 was (#36, +4). Racial undertones throughout this factor will be highlighted throughout this interpretation. Although race played a major role in interpreting this factor, this group does not consider their reputations to be tarnished or stained (#7, -4): *“I have a great reputation for being competent and thorough”* (Participant #39). This group of participants considers themselves to be proficient in their current roles (#8, -4): *“I am proficient in my role and there is no reason for my superior to consider otherwise”* (Participant #29). They are not concerned with the risks associated with trying new things and relocating for career opportunities (#34, -3; #15, -3): *“I’ve moved cross-country twice for work, and I would do it again if necessary”* (Participant #39). They have a social support system outside of their institution but again, like Factor 1, there is no access to the inner circles within the institution (#17, -3). This group of participants have not given up even when the odds seem to be stacked against them. They continue to apply themselves and seek opportunities even when there is a lack of commitment to diversity in their institution with little to no representation of color in upper leadership roles (#33, +3; #20, -4). This group of participants was much more sensitive to racial undercurrents due to their direct experience with it in the workplace, *“I have experienced racist remarks or racist jokes while in the work setting”* (Participant #19). They felt quite strongly about not being labeled as a “token” or a “sell-out” only for the sake of progressing (#25, +3; #3, +3).

Participant #2 loaded the highest on Factor 3 with .7365. Participant #2 was a 48-year-old male who was the only participant to receive both of his bachelor's and master's degrees from an HBCU. He revealed why he chose to rank statement #32 with a +4:

Being one of very few minority males, the expectation is to always be a cut above the rest. The interesting thing is there are only two minority males in upper administration with little to no opportunities for any mentorship for other minority males who may be interested in moving upwards.

Participant #29 ranked #32, a statement regarding being held to a higher standard, as most significant because:

On a number of occasions, I have seen colleagues not face the level of scrutiny or reprimand I would face for similar or the same mistakes. I constantly feel the pressure that I must produce the best results in the office to simply keep my position, let alone be considered for an advancement.

Participant #29 also acknowledged why he ranked #24, a statement regarding being privy to unwritten rules and hidden curriculum, as most significant:

I am not the biggest proponent of politics, I strongly believe that a person's work should be defined by their substance, ethic, and merit. However, "inner circles" seemingly trump the aforementioned characteristics when it comes to career advancement in my office. Needless to add, I have not benefited from a "circle" I have not been a part of.

To add to the conversation on the topic of inner circles, comments were taken from Participant #33 to try to understand his rationale for ranking the item high. He stated:

I often feel the oddball when it comes to being in good standing with the inner circle. My counterparts that are a part of the circle are given more opportunities and receive recognition.

Participant #10 stated her rationale for ranking statement #36 at a +4:

There are so many complexities to this. I have been treated differently even when I styled my hair differently. I have been recommended for jobs or duties when there is an expectation of interacting with a minority student from impoverished circumstances.

Participant #33's feeling regarding statement #36 was also taken into consideration. He stated:

I have encountered conversations where stereotypes are made, which have undoubtedly impacted opportunities.

Participant #10 provided some insight on why she ranked statement #33 as high:

Many predominantly white institutions pay this lip service and when it boils down to it, they will only continue diversity programs if it suits them. This is based on public exposure or some monetary gain.

Participant #15 added to the conversation regarding the lack of commitment to diversity. She stated:

I have worked at two PWIs that both "talk" a good game but the behind the scenes decisions speak for themselves and that includes the reduction of scholarships for minorities, the minimal number of diverse people within departments and the almost non-existent number of faculty members of color.

Factor 3 was comprised of 9 distinguishing statements (#24, 36, 10, 31, 26, 15, and 20).

The distinguishing statements for Factor 3 can be found in Table 16.

Table 16: Distinguishing Statements for Factor 3

No.	Statement	Rank	Score
24	I simply do not have access to the inner circles of leadership in my predominantly White institution.	+4	1.81*
36	I have experienced systemic prejudices and racism.	+4	1.78*
10	I have not been able to develop strategic relationships with people who can help me advance my career	+1	0.56*
31	I have not been in the right place at the right time.	-2	-0.84
26	I have not shared my plans to advance with leadership; therefore, they are unaware of my aspirations.	-2	-0.86*
15	I have been unwilling or reluctant to relocate in order to advance professionally.	-3	-1.22*
20	I do not see other people of color in the higher administrative levels so I haven't sought advancement opportunities for fear of not "fitting in".	-4	-1.59*

*Indicates significance at $P < .01$

Administrators who loaded on Factor 3 seemed to be impacted by racism and discrimination in the workplace. This group of administrators felt they were being held to a higher standard than their White counterparts. Although they were looking to advance in their careers, they were determined that it would not be at the expense of their integrity. Selling out and being labeled as "token" were not options for this group of participants; they would not consider conforming for the sake of "fitting in". A feeling of being blatantly disrespected and disregarded seemed to emerge for those who loaded on Factor 3. The perception is that their institutions have not made a commitment to diversity and their lack of career progression is a direct result of such practices.

Factor 4: The Dismissed

Factor 4 accounted for 7% of the explained variance with 4 defining sorts (participants 22, 25, 35, and 36). Factor 4 was the only factor that loaded with only female sorts and they were all Florida residents. The participants in this group ranged in age from 37-56 years old. None of the participants had a mentor but two of the women had some sort of professional affiliation. Three of the participants had earned a master's degree and one selected "other" as their highest education attainment. Of the four participants, one participant earned her bachelor's from an HBCU. The other bachelors' and master's degrees were earned from a PWI. The number of years working for their current institution were listed as: 2 participants < 5 years, 1 participant 5-9 years, and 1 participant 10-14 years. The number of years working in an administrative level position were listed as: 1 participant < 5 years, 1 participant 5-9 years, and 2 participants 10-14 years. The areas in higher education represented in Factor 4 are as follows: 1 from Academic Affairs, 1 from Administrative Affairs, and 2 from Student Affairs. The demographic data for this factor is listed in Table 17.

Table 17: Demographic Characteristics of Participants Loading on Factor 4

Participant	State	Sex	Age	Education	Mentoring	Prof. Affiliations	Undergrad Institution	Master's Institution	Doctoral Institution	Yrs. w/ Inst.	Total Yrs. Admin.	Category of Position
22	FL	Female	42	Master's	No	No	PWI	PWI	-	< 5	< 5	Student Affairs
25	FL	Female	37	Master's	No	No	PWI	PWI	-	<5	10-14	Student Affairs
35	FL	Female	56	Other	No	Yes	PWI	PWI	-	5-9	5-9	Admin. Affairs
36	FL	Female	46	Master's	No	Yes	HBCU	PWI	-	10-14	10-14	Academic Affairs

The participants who loaded on Factor 4 viewed the statements listed in Table 18 as most significant by ranking them with either +4 and +3 (most significant) or -4 and -3 (least significant).

Table 18: Highest Factor Scores-Factor 4

No.	Statement	Factor 4	
		Rank	Z-Scores
*1	My college/university does not have a formal mentoring system in place.	+4	2.262
*13	I have not yet been able to acquire sufficient experience.	+4	1.858
10	I have not been able to develop strategic relationships with people who can help me advance my career.	+4	1.689
37	I refuse to engage in office politics.	+3	1.361
31	I have not been in the right place at the right time.	+3	1.253
3	I am not willing to “sell-out” or conform.	+3	.906
30	I am often mistaken for being combative and aggressive, whereas my White colleagues are perceived as being passionate.	-3	-0.960
4	I have worked (or am currently working) for an unstable organization with constant turnover amongst leadership.	-3	-0.969
2	I am not able to communicate effectively due to cultural differences.	-3	-1.732
*25	I do not want to be labeled as a “token”.	-4	-1.740
*40	I think my age has held me back.	-4	-1.757
*36	I have experienced systemic prejudices and racism.	-4	-2.067

Note: *represents distinguishing items.

The participants from this group shared many of the same feelings with participants from Factors 1, 2 and 3. Their sorts suggested that they perceived the lack of mentorship opportunities, sufficient experience, and professional contacts to be among the reasons they had not progressed in their careers. In Factor 4, the sorted responses revealed lack of mentorship as

one of the major barriers to success. Like participants from Factor 1, they had not developed relationships with the right people who could help them to advance. Not only were they not connected with a mentor or network of professionals, this group of administrators also lacked the work experience needed to advance in their careers. Even in light of their inability to be competitive, due to the lack of solid networks and sufficient experience, participants from this group still had demands or conditions they felt should be considered. While remaining committed to maintaining a professional reputation, they were quite adamant about not being considered a “sell-out”.

Administrators loading on Factor 4 were not concerned with being the only person of color in in their work environment. Being considered the “token” did not dissuade them from pursuing promotion opportunities (#24, +4). Unlike Factor 3, this perspective did not include elements of racism or discriminatory practices. In fact, administrators who loaded on Factor 4 felt they worked for stable forward thinking institutions where there was strong commitment to diversity. Although this factor included one of the oldest participants, and the youngest participant was in their mid-thirties, age was not ranked as a significant barrier (#40, -4).

This group of administrators appeared to be less concerned with being recognized. They did not go the extra mile to make themselves noticed. They had been passed up for opportunities because they were viewed as insignificant. Statements taken from the post-sort questionnaire revealed administrators’ viewpoints about being overlooked because they do not possess many of the qualities being sought.

Participant #22 loaded the highest on Factor 4 at .6506. She placed #30 at -4. She spoke about how she would use her “voice” to speak up when needed. She stated,

I am not docile by any means and will stand up for what is right and wrong. I am assertive when the situation calls for it. I have tact and I am adept at mediating and conflict resolution. So, this perception, I would like to believe, does not relate to me and how I may be perceived. I tend to have the reputation of the “peace keeper”.

Participant #22 also explained why she had not managed to develop strategic relationships with people who could help her to advance her career.

For the same reasons that I have not developed a network of professionals outside of my own place of work, this also spills into my inability to develop strategic relationships with people who can help advance my career. I’m not implying that I don’t have any, just that I would be much further in my professional career if I did have a bigger circle, in or out of my current place of employment.

Additionally, participant #35, the oldest to load on Factor 4 at age 56 years old, shared her thoughts on the mentoring programs in her institution. She said,

There are opportunities for growth with mentorship but I have not sought after any mentors. Higher positions are usually given to those who have been mentored or taken into the inner circles of leadership. I do not have time to devote to this sort of thing.

Participant #25 expressed why she felt she had been passed up for promotional opportunities.

She identified her inability to speak up for what she wanted as a major weakness. She stated,

I am an introvert to its most phobic and paralyzing level. I have not allowed myself to be in the company of others to network and to learn from others outside of my place of employment. I am most comfortable creating opportunities where others can gather, but I don’t find pleasure attending anything that requires me to talk. This is a huge hindrance to my forward movement.

Factor 4 was comprised of 9 distinguishing statements (1, 13, 6, 15, 34, 32, 25, 40, and 36). The distinguishing statements for Factor 4 are listed in Table 19.

Table 19: Distinguishing Statements for Factor 4

No.	Statement	Rank	Score
1	My college/university does not have a formal mentoring system in place.	+4	2.26*
13	I have not yet been able to acquire sufficient experience.	+4	1.86*
6	It's a challenge for me to trust that the feedback I receive is constructive and so I sometimes don't take it very well.	+1	0.51
15	I have been unwilling or reluctant to relocate in order to advance professionally.	+1	0.51*
34	I am not a risk-taker and can be afraid of trying	+1	0.47
32	I am held to a higher standard as a person of color.	-2	-0.76*
25	I do not want to be labeled as a "token".	-4	-1.74*
40	I think my age has held me back.	-4	-1.76*
36	I have experienced systemic prejudices and racism.	-4	-2.07*

*Indicates significance at $P < .01$

Administrators loading on Factor 4 indicated that the lack of exposure to mentors, professional contacts, and sufficient experience have all worked in direct opposition to their advancing in their careers. Some of the administrators, through multiple post-sort responses, reported that they do not communicate their innermost thoughts easily. This flaw in their approach to communication has directly impacted their ability to advance, thus causing them to be overlooked. As gathered from the factor array, distinguishing statements, and post-sort questionnaire responses, many of the barriers are self-imposed. Being closed to constructive feedback and being unwilling to consider relocating for career opportunities are both factors that

can be controlled by the individual. Administrators who loaded on Factor 3 have made the choice to shy away from risk by erring on the side of caution. Playing it safe, for this group of participants, may have worked against them and caused them to lose out on advancement opportunities.

Factor 5: The Disinterested

Factor 5 was defined by 5 sorts, which accounted for 8% of the explained variance. Of the 40 participants, the 5 who loaded onto the perspective represented in Factor 5 were participants: 5, 7, 11, 24, and 30. Only one male loaded on Factor 5, and he was the only participant to live outside Florida. This 48-year-old North Carolina resident also was the oldest of the group. The participants from Factor 5 ranged in age from 29 to 48. Four of them had secured a mentor at some point in their careers, and they all were involved in some sort of professional affiliation. Two of the participants their bachelor's degrees at an HBCU; however, they all earned their master's at a PWI. The number of years working for their current institution were listed as: 3 participants < 5 years, 1 participant 5-9 years, and 1 participant 15-19 years. The number of years working in an administrative level positions were listed as: 1 participant < 5 years, 1 participant 5-9 years, 2 participants 10-14 years, and 1 participant 15-19 years. The areas in higher education being represented in Factor 5 were as follows: 2 in Enrollment Services and 1 in Student Affairs. Two of the participants selected "Other" as their option. The demographic data for this factor is listed in Table 20.

Table 20: Demographic Characteristics of Participants on Factor 5

Participant	State	Sex	Age	Education	Mentoring	Prof. Affiliations	Undergrad Institution	Master's Institution	Doctoral Institution	Yrs. w/ Inst.	Total Yrs. Admin.	Category of Position
5	FL	Female	29	Master's	Yes	Yes	PWI	PWI	-	< 5	< 5	Student Affairs
7	FL	Female	47	Master's	Yes	Yes	HBCU	PWI	-	15-19	10-14	Other
11	FL	Female	39	Master's	No	Yes	PWI	PWI	-	< 5	15-19	Enroll Services
24	FL	Female	32	Other	Yes	Yes	PWI	PWI	-	5-9	5-9	Enroll Services
30	NC	Male	48	Master's	Yes	Yes	HBCU	PWI	-	< 5	10-14	Other

The participants who loaded on Factor 5 viewed the following statements, found in Table 21, as most significant by ranking them with either +4 and +3 (Most Significant) or -4 and -3 (Least Significant).

Table 21: Highest Factor Scores-Factor 5

No.	Statement	Factor 5	
		Rank	Z-Scores
37	I refuse to engage in office politics.	+4	1.945
15	I have been unwilling or reluctant to relocate in order to advance professionally.	+4	1.641
25	I do not want to be labeled as a “token”.	+4	1.415
*6	It’s a challenge for me to trust that the feedback I receive is constructive and so I sometimes don’t take it very well.	+3	1.322
10	I have not been able to develop strategic relationships with people who can help me advance my career.	+3	1.282
*34	I am not a risk-taker and can be afraid of trying.	+3	1.207
23	I am not privy to hidden rules or curriculum of PWIs.	-3	-1.119
7	My reputation seems to be tainted and it precedes me.	-3	-1.389
*41	I work in a college/university that just doesn't understand.	-3	-1.435
*33	There is a lack of commitment in my inst. toward diversity.	-4	-1.499
*38	My advancement has been limited to diversity-related positions.	-4	-1.807
*3	I am not willing to “sell-out” or conform.	-4	-1.986

Note: *represents distinguishing items.

Participants who loaded on Factor 5 had at some point become unconcerned with trying to overcome any barriers or challenges that could have impeded their career progression. They recognized job related impediments for what they were, obstacles standing in the way of their

being promoted to upper levels of leadership. Although fully aware of the barriers, they expressed no interest in trying to overcome them. The barriers this group appeared to have experienced had to do with their being unwilling to compromise for the sake of being promoted. This group did not blame the institution. In fact, they acknowledged that they believed their institutions were committed to diversity and had taken the time to understand Black people (#33, -4; #41, -3). *“My college is diverse and understands most cultures”* (Participant #7, #41). While they did not trust constructive feedback from upper leadership, they did not appear to have any problems following the rules put in place for them (#6, +3). Factor 5 did not share many of the same complaints about the academy that were found in Factors 1-4. Their lack of advancement was based more on their unwillingness to extend themselves to be considered for promotional opportunities. They were not in agreement with the idea that their career growth had been stunted because they were not privy to the unwritten rules (#23, -3) *“I may not know all of the rules but I know that they are there”* (Participant 11). Again, they did not appear to be looking to place blame, as they did not consider the institution to be at fault for where they were choosing to be in their careers.

This group of participants felt they had been able to maintain a good reputation by respecting and following the standard rules of their work environment (#7, -3; #3, -4), *“I never think of selling out or conforming. I am obedient to my superiors whoever they may be, Black or White”* (Participant #7, #3). An emphasis was placed on following the rules as long as the rules did not violate their self-imposed guidelines and standards. They recognized that being unwilling to relocate for leadership opportunities had hindered their career progression, which they understood and had accepted as this group had adopted a risk-averse mindset (#15, +4; #34, +3). This group of participants resisted being labeled as a “token” or the expert on all

things diversity related (#25, +4, and this may explain why they were not considered for diversity related leadership positions. (#38-4). Developing strategic relationships was not of interest to this group because they refused to play the office politics that typically comes along with developing such relationships (#10, +3; #37, +4).

The factor array showed that the administrators were aware that their careers were at a standstill because they were unwilling to consider things such as relocating, engaging in office politics, conforming or “selling out,” or seeking diversity-related positions. Of the five factors, this was the only factor to have a positive loading on statement #21 (I have gotten to the point where I do not believe I will succeed in my efforts to advance). A positive loading indicates that this group of administrators had become detached from the idea of advancing in their careers.

The following responses were taken from the post-sort interviews in order to provide a deeper understanding of the perspectives of Factor 5 participants who have become “Disinterested” in progressing in the academy:

Participant #5, at age 29, has already made the determination that she is not interested in only diversity-related positions. She has also recognized how much her dedication to family and averseness to risk has held her back yet she remains unwilling to make any adjustments. She stated:

I have not worked in a diversity-related position. I make it clear that I do not intend to be pigeon-holed into a career based on my skin color. I honestly feel that my talents and education could be refined into a much more lucrative career, practice, or business if I were not so risk averse. Family is very important to me. I will not sacrifice parents or children in the process.

Participant #24 explained her position on being unwilling to sell out or conform for the purpose of advancing:

I do not believe that I should have to “sell out” or conform to anything but the job duties that I was given when I applied and accepted the position.

Participant #30 displayed his disagreement with things such as self-promoting and office politics:

[Self-marketing] is just not that important to me as a seasoned career individual. Office politics seem to assist others in advancing in their careers. I am just not willing to engage in that type of politics to advance my career.

Factor 5 was comprised of 9 distinguishing statements (6, 34, 16, 36, 35, 41, 33, 38, and 3). Distinguishing statements for Factor 5 are found in Table 22.

Table 22: Distinguishing Statements for Factor 5

No.	Statement	Rank	Score
6	It's a challenge for me to trust that the feedback I receive is constructive and so I sometimes don't take it very well.	+3	1.32
34	I am not a risk-taker and can be afraid of trying.	+3	1.21
16	I haven't been able to strike the right work-home balance.	0	0.34
36	I have experienced systemic prejudices and racism.	-2	-0.75*
35	I have to compete with other minorities for the limited positions opened to us.	-2	-1.11*
41	I work in a college/university that just doesn't understand.	-3	-1.43*
33	There is a lack of commitment in my institution toward diversity.	-4	-1.50*
38	My advancement has been limited to diversity-related positions.	-4	-1.81*
3	I am not willing to “sell-out” or conform.	-4	-1.99*

*Indicates significance at $P < .01$

Factor 5 administrators had become inflexible and unwilling to make any adjustments for the purpose of advancing in their career. Administrators with Factor 5 perspective were not concerned with challenges that surfaced in the other factors. The lack of education, experience and connection to the inner circles were not identified as issues by this group of administrators. This group was not interested in trying to overcome any barriers standing in the way of advancing in their careers. It appeared that administrators who loaded on Factor 5 were content with their level of leadership. They were not concerned with advancing in their careers, especially if it involved having to go outside of their self-defined norms.

Factor 5 administrators showed that not everyone may want to advance to the next level in leadership, countering the assumption made in this work that everyone who may be eligible for advancement would automatically feel slighted if they did not advance. Factor 5 revealed that this is not always the case. Unlike Factors 1-4, the administrators who loaded on Factor 5 did not find it necessary to modify anything about themselves for the purposes of advancing in their careers.

Summary

Chapter IV presented the data analysis process which included the correlation matrix, factor analysis, and factor interpretation from the study. Forty Black administrators sorted 41 statements regarding barriers or challenges they consider to be the greatest impediments to their career progression or advancement in higher education. These statements were sorted on a continuum based on individual perspectives and experiences from “least significant” (-4) to “most significant” (+4). PQMethod 2.35 (Schmolck & Atkinson, 2014) was used to create a correlation matrix to illustrate the relationship between each participant’s Q sorts. With 40 participants, the correlation matrix was a 40 X 40 array (Appendix M). The data taken from the

correlation matrix assisted in the factor analysis, rotation, and interpretation process. Five factors emerged, each representing a different perspective held by the participants who sorted them. The five factors were named *The Disconnected*, *The Disadvantaged*, *The Disrespected*, *The Dismissed*, and *The Disinterested*. Demographic information was used along with factor rankings and post sort comments to interpret each factor. A discussion, summary, implications, limitations, and recommendations for further research will be provided in Chapter V.

CHAPTER V: DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

This study focused on the attitudes and perspectives of Black administrators regarding barriers to the accessibility and attainment of executive-level administrative opportunities in higher education. The problem identified was the lack of empirical data derived from studies of Black administrators which address career disparities across racial lines (Jackson, 2001). For the current study, mid-level administrators were chosen because this is the level in leadership where Blacks are most represented. There seems to be a bottleneck that does not allow Blacks to progress as effortlessly into the next level of leadership as their White counterparts. The assumption was made that naturally all Black administrators desire to advance in their careers from mid-level to upper-level leadership. The assumption was also made that it would become problematic for those impacted if or when they do not progress to the next level. Literature supported the assumption that limited opportunities for advancement could serve as a frustration for mid-level administration (Johnsrud, 1996).

Relevant literature on Black administrators, both current and historical, in higher education provided the foundation for analyzing the perceptions of Black administrators regarding career progression. Operational terms were defined to provide a clear understanding of how certain terms should be used throughout the study. CRT (Bell, 2003; Ladson-Billings & Tate, 1995; Solórzano & Yosso, 2001) was used as a theoretical framework to connect and view mid-level administrators, career advancement, and racial barriers. An overview of the main tenets of CRT was provided to identify ways race and political power affect Black mid-level administrators and their career progression.

The goals of this study were to provide a voice for a group of Black administrators in an attempt to understand their experiences and feelings toward career progression, identify

discriminatory barriers that could be viewed as impediments to their career progression, and contribute to the discussion on leadership and diversity in higher education. Q methodology, the study of human subjectivity, was instrumental to achieving the goals of the study. In seeking to understand the perceptions of a marginalized group of people such as Black mid-level administrators in higher education, Q methodology served as a conduit for their voices to be heard. Brown (2006) affirmed that the use of Q methodology is of great value, especially when the topic of interest is associated with matters regarding marginalization. Brown added that if employed properly, Q methodology “remains close to the experiences of the poor, the disempowered, the despairing, taking as its raw materials the thoughts and feelings of these individuals, as expressed in their own words, which, when submitted to statistical analysis, results in factors of operant subjectivity” (p. 378). The main question that guided this study was: What are the attitudes and perspectives of Black administrators in higher education regarding barriers to the accessibility and attainment of executive-level leadership opportunities?

An overview of Q methodology was provided along with a description of the research design. Q methodology was used as a means to build a concourse, choose a Q sample, collect Q sorts, and run the data analysis. To secure participants for the study, recruitment emails were sent to the Equal Employment Opportunity and Diversity and Inclusion Offices of public PWIs across the state of Florida. When those searches failed to return a sufficient number of participants, a snowball sampling technique had to be deployed to secure the 40 people who ultimately participated in the study. In order to reach the desired number of participants, invitations were extended to prospects outside of Florida.

The first phase of the study entailed conducting semi-structured interviews. Eight of the 40 participants were interviewed privately at a location of their choosing. The results from the interviews were used to help build the concourse that was ultimately edited down to construct the research instrument (Q sample).

During the second phase of the study, forty participants sorted the Q sample based on their perceptions regarding career progression in higher education. Each participant completed a post-sort demographic questionnaire at the conclusion of the sorting process. After examination of the data, findings concerning Black administrators' perceptions regarding career progression were discussed in great detail.

The factor analysis procedures including factor rotation, factor extraction and factor interpretation were thoroughly discussed. Five factors representing five groups of Black administrators' perspectives regarding challenges and barriers to career progression in higher education were identified and discussed. Themes for each factor were identified during the analysis of the factor arrays, participant demographic information, distinguishing statements, and participants' comments. During the factor interpretation phase of the study, the five factors were named: Factor 1: *The Disconnected*, Factor 2: *The Disadvantaged*, Factor 3: *The Disrespected*, Factor 4: *The Dismissed*, and Factor 5: *The Disinterested*.

Findings from the study indicate the participants hold five distinct perspectives regarding barriers to career progression in higher education. As the findings were inspected, it became increasingly obvious that the factors may have shared some similarities but they were all distinctly different from each other.

A lack of connection was strongly emphasized in *The Disconnected* perspective. Participants who loaded on this perspective felt their career progression had been stifled because

they had not been connected to the right people. In *The Disconnected* perspective, participants indicated they had not been able to develop strategic relationships with people who can help with career advancement and there is no support from peers. People of color are especially scarce among leaders who are willing to help this group of participants. Due to the limited number of people of color in leadership roles, this group of participants have deliberately decided not to self-promote or seek advancement opportunities. This perspective is summarized in the comment of participant #12, who stated, “*it appears only 2-3 of the leaders are persons of color...It’s hard as a staff member to see so little diversity in my leaders at an institution where diversity is preached as a core value*”. The participants who held *The Disconnected* perspective believed they were well equipped to progress to the next level of leadership by a solid educational foundation, sufficient work experience and proficiency in their current roles.

Unlike *The Disconnected*, those who aligned with *The Disadvantaged* perspective considered themselves to have all of the right connections and networks in place to be successful. Participants who loaded on *The Disadvantaged* perspective have developed strategic relationships with people who can help them to advance in their career, and they also have a network of professionals outside the institution. *The Disadvantaged* group of participants appeared to be liked and supported by those around them as their reputation does not seem to be tainted, they communicate well across cultural lines, and they are not viewed as combative or aggressive. *The Disadvantaged* identified the inability to strike the right home and work balance as a major barrier that has impeded their career progression. Participants who held *The Disadvantaged* perspective had the misfortune of having their careers stall only because their circumstances did not allow for them to proceed. Coleman (2002) identified close to 30 different factors that could prevent career advancement for Black administrators in higher

education. Of those 30 factors, several were self-imposed, including inadequate professional experience, insufficient education, and lack of social or moral support outside of the institution. Aside from the inability to develop a balance between their work and home lives, *The Disadvantaged* group also expressed strong reservations about relocating for career advancement. In several instances, relocating was listed as not being an option due to conflicting obligations. The inability to relocate may be something that can be worked around when attempting to advance, but there are some things that cannot. *The Disadvantaged* group of participants' most impactful challenge was that they did not have the credentials or degrees required to progress. Participant # 21 stated, "*I do not have my PhD yet which has seriously limited me. I have plateaued in my career at this point without it.*" Without being able to meet the qualifications, the participants found it moot for them to share their aspirations with non-progressive institutions and leaders who do not value employee advancement.

The Disrespected perspective was loaded on by the largest group of participants. *The Disrespected* perspective aligned with the literature on challenges and obstacles Blacks face when being considered for promotional opportunities in the workplace (Coleman, 2002; Herbrand, 2001; Kanter, 1993; Lunsford, 1984; Smith, 1998). Kanter (1993) listed tokenism as yet another challenge that Blacks are forced to contend with when trying to advance to the next level. Kanter continued that racial tokenism is the act of elevating Blacks in highly visible positions as the experts of all things race-related, causing them to be resented by members of their own cultural group. Participants from this group felt they had not progressed because they refused to conform or be labeled as a token. Participant #10 stated, "*The closer our behavior resembles that of the dominant culture, the more (the) professional advancement opportunities.*" Participant # 32 was firm in his statement when stating, "*I want to be given opportunities based*

on my merit and capabilities, not to meet a minority quota". This group of participants emphasized being treated unfairly and experiencing microaggressions and systemic racism while working for institutions that were not committed to diversity and inclusion. They appeared to feel as if they were being held to higher standard than their White counterparts. Participant #32 stated, "*I feel immense pressure to far exceed my White counterparts in order to receive any type of recognition.*" Contrary to what may be expected, this group of participants self-report that they do not have bad reputations, they are proficient in their current positions, and they are not afraid to take risks (such as relocating) associated with going after opportunities if needed. With such positive attributes and in an attempt to provide a plausible explanation for why they had not progressed beyond mid-level leadership, a few additional barriers surfaced and were analyzed. It appeared this group was being blatantly disregarded for reasons that were obviously race related. In the effort to try to refrain from using the "race card", oftentimes marginalized people will try to identify other reasons for being oppressed. For fear of being labeled as a "race card player" many people will not resort to saying that race has played a major role in their career progression or lack thereof. Dei, Karumanchery, and Karumanchery-Luik (2007) asserted it is commonly said that race no longer is a factor and skin color or complexion does not matter, but racism is real and it does not disappear simply because its existence is being ignored. When the concept of race is dismissed, permission for the conversation to be silenced is granted. Racism involves having the power to carry out systemic discriminatory practices continuously, unlike discrimination and bigotry (Sue, 2003). *The Disrespected* perspective suggested that being barred from the inner circles of leadership felt like being banned from the country club where entrance is predicated on skin color. The comments in response to some of the post-sort questions indicated that even though the

participants had not been successful, they were going to continue to pursue advancement opportunities.

Another viewpoint held by Black administrators included in the study was *The Dismissed* perspective. In exploring *The Dismissed* perspective, it was revealed that the lack of mentorship programs was considered a major impediment to career progression. In one of the responses taken from the post-sort questionnaires, a participant spoke about how she had been promised by leadership that she would be linked to a mentor through her institution's mentorship program. After several failed attempts, she had begun to accept the idea that she would not be afforded the opportunity as promised. Mentorship systems have been found to be beneficial as they help to foster an environment of learning and support (Patitu & Hinton, 2003). Unfortunately, the perspectives of *The Dismissed* revealed that the administrators in this group not only were unable to participate in mentoring programs but they also did not possess sufficient work experience. One of the participants noted that training opportunities were limited in her field, which directly resulted in her being left behind as far as professional development was concerned. If training is not encouraged, then it becomes increasingly difficult to become marketable when trying to advance to the next level in leadership. *The Dismissed* perspective also revealed that the participants had not been able to develop strategic relationships with people of color who could help them to advance in their career. Not having a mentor, sufficient experience or strategic relationships with notable or influential people of color have put a noticeable damper on this group's career growth.

Unlike *The Disrespected* viewpoint, *The Dismissed* do not report any acts of systemic racism or prejudice. They also have openly admitted that they would not be opposed to being labeled as a "token". Being labeled as the "token" does not equate to conforming and it does

not mean that someone has become a “sell-out”. It simply means they are willing to be the only person of color represented in any given environment. This became evident as the *The Dismissed* perspective was analyzed more closely. This group of administrators highlighted their desire to advance to the next level in their careers. However, it became increasingly obvious that their desires to advance were overshadowed by their lack of experience, lack of connections, and inability to be flexible. Although they did not have the experience required to progress, participants of *The Dismissed* perspective were not willing to “sell-out” or get involved in office politics to use as leverage or some sort of bargaining tool. Refusing to play office politics is consistent with the idea of “letting your work speak for itself” and sometimes it works but often times it does not. Even with a placid and pleasant attitude, those refusing to “play the game” may be ostracized and not considered for advancement opportunities. “*I am not docile by any means and will stand up for what is right and wrong. I am assertive when the situation calls for it... The one thing that I hold dear is my reputation and character. I try to be careful with my words and actions so that my reputation stays spotless and hands remain clean*” (Participant #22). In this case, *The Dismissed* perspective aligns with literature that is based on Blacks having to defend their level of passion in the workplace against comments that describe them as being aggressive (Guillory, 2001).

Black mid-level administrators collectively clustered around *The Disinterested* perspective. The administrators who shared this perspective were more interested in communicating their demands or conditions than they were concerned with learning what was required for them to advance. They treated career advancement as an option if and only if they did not have to step outside of their comfort zone. This perspective’s career progression may have been limited due to self-imposed conditions. The participants suggested that they wanted

to advance in their career but not if it meant they would have to do things like relocate, take on unforeseen risk, be labeled as a token, engage in office politics, or actively seek to develop strategic relationships with other people of color. It was clear that advancing to the next level was not as important to this group of administrators as it was for the others. They would not seek to excel at the expense of forsaking their own morals or standards. Career stalling was attributed to their rigid approach. To make the situation worse, this group of administrators did not welcome constructive feedback because they were not open to suggestions that would imply a need for change.

The Disinterested perspective highlighted the idea that not everyone may be interested in advancing to the next level of leadership. Some are content with their current place in the hierarchy. The added stress that could potentially come with moving up the career ladder could deter some from pursuing opportunities. Research regarding *The Disinterested* perspective was absent from the literature.

Summary of the Study

The purpose of the study was to examine the attitudes and perspectives of Black administrators regarding barriers to the accessibility and attainment of executive-level leadership opportunities. More specifically, the subjective ways in which Black administrators view career progression beyond mid-level administrative positions were sought. Historical data shows that Black professionals do not progress at the same rate as their White counterparts in academia. There has been a continuous struggle in the Black community to acquire and maintain equitable employment. According to Ladson-Billings (1998) discriminatory practices are found within educational institutions as they are found in any other workplace across the

nation. The same racial barriers that exist in society also exist in the academy. Institutions of higher education are microcosms of the world we live in.

The substantial disparities that exist between Blacks and Whites at executive levels of leadership warrants a discussion. Blacks, regardless of education or years of experience, do not advance beyond mid-level administration at the same rate as their White counterparts and thus the original career disparities are exacerbated. When there are few or no other Blacks at the executive levels of leadership to model after or observe, it becomes difficult to remain positive about career goals.

Not only is it important for Blacks to be able to witness other Blacks operating in authority roles in higher education, but it is important for Black students to observe them as well. Diversity should be a focus at all levels of leadership as institutions of higher education expand to include a multicultural student body. To address the needs of a growing body of multicultural students, there should be an unwavering commitment made to increase the number of Blacks employed at all levels of leadership. College presents its own set of challenges for students. Being alone without a familiar sense of support only adds another layer of anxiety and distress to an already stressful situation. Black students need to be able to relate to Blacks in leadership positions who may be able to positively influence their experiences as students of color. When there is a lack of role models for Black students, they may feel they do not belong. Students without a sense of belonging will often isolate themselves from others, and this is a risk factor for dropping out of the institution. To address all students and their needs, more focus should be placed on addressing the disproportionate numbers of Blacks versus Whites in leadership roles in institutions across the nation. The needs of the students should be as important to the institution as any other areas when considering opportunities for growth.

The lived experiences of Black administrators were instrumental to this study because they directly contributed to the manner in which each participant sorted the instrument. The information gathered through the Q sorts provided an insight into how Blacks view career progression in higher education. The interpretation of the five factors, derived from the Q sorts, was helpful in understanding the attitudes and perspectives Black mid-level administrators held about advancing beyond mid-level into the upper echelon of administration. It was duly noted that the findings could not be generalized to a larger population of administrators; however, the importance and significance of the study should not be discounted.

Literature is scant regarding Black administrators and their career progression in higher education, and literature based on Black administrators' perspectives and viewpoints is even scarcer. The findings of this study offer information that has been missing from the literature; therefore, this study presents an opportunity for the perspectives of Black administrators in higher education to be added to the body of knowledge on the topic.

Limitations

As with any study, limitations were identified in this study. From the outset, the literature review revealed a deficit in research on Black administrators' career progression in higher education. More specifically, there is a dearth of literature geared to providing an understanding of the subjective viewpoints of Black administrators regarding career advancement in higher education. Since the study was focused on a specific population of people, the study was limited to Black administrators employed by public institutions of higher education. Convenience sampling was used to identify eight administrators who participated in the portion of the study in which the communication concourse and the Q sample were constructed. The participants were all employees of mid-sized, public PWIs in Northeast

Florida. The responses taken from the semi-structured interviews were used to help to build the concourse. Interviews were conducted to build the concourse because there was very little subjective literature available.

Researcher bias and prior relationships should also be listed as a possible limitation to the study. Prior relationships with the interviewees were taken into consideration. Five of the 8 participants were former coworkers and the remaining 3 had worked at some point under my tutelage. Our prior relationships could have very well been the reason they chose to participate in the study. It is also possible that our relationship could have had a bearing on how they responded to the questions. They could have responded in a manner that they felt would align with what was expected of them. To combat this potential limitation, the researcher's positionality was identified and explained to those participating in the interviewing phase of the study. However, during the sorting phase of a Q methodology study, researcher's bias is somewhat controlled by "loading the dice" in favor of the participants' points of view (Brown, 2006, p. 365). Essentially, Q methodology provides a way for participants to assign meaning to their experience through their arrangement of statements with minimal influence by the researcher (Brown, 1993).

Once the information needed was gathered from the interviews, a request for contact information was sent to the Equal Employment Opportunity and Diversity and Inclusion offices of public PWIs throughout Florida. Fewer than half of the institutions responded to the request. From those who did respond, a master list of 305 Black mid-level administrators was compiled. Upon retrieval of the contact information, recruitment emails were sent to all 305 prospects. Of the 305 prospects, 40 (13%) responded within 3 months. The number of responses came as a result of bi-weekly email reminders. Although the response rate was low, it should be noted that

Q studies when compared with other studies are generally less concerned with low response rates. Q methodology typically uses small sample sizes; therefore, a large response rate does not have an influence on the results.

Invitations to prospects were not extended to any faculty members or entry- or upper level administrators. Also, only prospects with a master's degree or higher were allowed to participate in the study. The study was limited to Black mid-level administrators with a master's degree working for a public PWI. The study was initially extended to only institutions in Florida. However, upon realizing how low the rate of response was a networking type of sampling technique was deployed. Participants who were interested in the outcomes of the study requested permission to share the instrument with others within their network of professional contacts from other states. This is how the study had 9 participants from states outside of Florida.

One of the most obvious limitations is the inability to generalize the results of study to a larger population. The viewpoints and perspectives highlighted in the study can only represent the viewpoints and perspectives of the participants in the study, and cannot be considered as representative of the general population. Q studies, by design, do not offer generalizability in a statistical sense. Unlike R-methodology where the aim is to generalize from large sample of participants to the population, Q methodology is less concerned with the number of participants and more concerned with identifying the existence of certain points of view (Watts & Stenner, 2012).

As a result of a technical upgrade to the university's internet system, the Q sorting program would not launch from any university related devices. Several participants reported that they did not complete the instrument because it would not launch from their desktop

computer or university owned smart device. This computer glitch caused the data collection period to be extended weeks beyond the projected timeframe. These developments were disappointing and very revealing of how computer based sorting may not be as reliable as other non-computer based sorting mechanisms may be. It is suggested that caution be taken whenever computer-based resources are used to conduct a Q study. Technical support will need to be stable and willing to provide assistance in the event it is needed; otherwise, the study can be delayed and postponed indefinitely.

Implications for Future Researchers, Practitioners, and Policy Makers

Through the use of Q methodology, perceptions of Black administrators regarding challenges to career progression were measured. The subjective perspectives of the group of participants in this study were sought to establish a better understanding of the viewpoints Black mid-level administrators hold regarding barriers that have hindered their ability to access and attain upper level leadership positions. While the results of Q studies are not meant to be generalized to a larger population, implications based on views highlighted in this study regarding career progression suggest further research is warranted. To improve generalizability and add to the dearth of literature surrounding the topic, it is recommended that the subject of Black mid-level administrators' career progression in higher education be researched from both a qualitative and quantitative standpoint.

Although it has been established that the presence of Black administrators in higher education is vital to the success of minority students, there still seem to be noticeable disparities nationwide between Blacks and Whites holding top-tier leadership positions (Jackson, 2004). Based on this work, institutions looking to fully engage and address a growing diverse student body can have a better understanding of their needs and make future decisions to incorporate

practices that will positively influence their minority students' enrollment, involvement, and rate of retention.

This study identified areas of opportunity for Human Resources departments to conduct audits and evaluations on the policies and procedures that drive their hiring and promotion processes. Research in this area could help Human Resources departments reach an ultimate goal of aligning hiring practices with their stated mission, vision, and purpose statements. Changes to hiring practices could positively impact the number of Blacks at all levels throughout the academy.

While this study sought the perspectives of actively employed Black administrators, there may be some meaning in acquiring the perspectives of those interested in becoming higher education administrators. Black students aspiring to become administrators or Black professionals considering transferring into academia could use the information from this study to make a more informed decision on whether or not they would want to pursue a career in higher education. Those who decide to pursue a career in higher education, even in light of the information provided, could use the study to inform their goal setting and professional development activities. For entry-level and mid-level administrators, views taken from the study can be used to assist with reassessing and readjusting their approaches to securing senior level leadership positions. They can reflect on what is perceived to be significant barriers to career progression and ascertain ways to avoid them.

The intent of this study was not to provide a comprehensive list of characteristics that could aid in career advancement, although there were some implications surrounding the use of supports such as networking programs, professional associations, and mentorship systems. As evidenced in the study, being connected to such professional circles may serve as a benefit to

Blacks looking to advance into the upper levels of administration. Further research on mentorship systems and professional affiliations for Black administrators in the academy is strongly encouraged as it may inform career mobility and progression.

Recommendations for Further Research

To accompany the aforementioned suggestions, recommendations for future research were determined. The study was initially limited to Black mid-level administrators working in public PWIs throughout the state of Florida. An invitation to participate was not extended to institutions outside of Florida until two months after several failed attempts were made to reach an acceptable number of respondents. Also, the decision to exclude private institutions from the study was made because the governing boards for them are drastically different from institution to institution. Public institutions were focused on as they are governed by most of the same policies and procedures from institution to institution, and they all had some sort of diversity clause in their mission statements. Private institutions could be considered in a future study to compare the experiences of Black mid-level administrators across both types of institutions. Future research should be conducted on the perspectives of Black faculty and Black lower and upper-level administrators regarding career progression. It would also add depth to the conversation if a study could be conducted from a White administrator's standpoint. That is, a study that would explore the perspectives of White administrators regarding the barriers or challenges they believe Blacks face in higher education is recommended. A subsequent study to compare the findings of both studies would be warranted to discuss the differences in perceptions across races.

Each of the factors that emerged from the data could be used as a basis for its own individual study. For example, a research study can be built around the details of *Factor 1: The*

Disconnected. The study could seek to understand the lived experiences of the Black administrators in higher education who would consider their careers to be stagnant due to the lack of connections to the right networks of professionals. Researchers could use Q methodology or any other method to draw comparisons for the purposes of providing a better understanding of how being connected to the right people or groups of people could be beneficial to career progression. Each of the five factors could be studied individually as they all have qualitative and quantitative implications for further research.

Researchers could study Black administrators who believe their careers had been stunted by systemic racial injustices. During the semi-structured interviews, each of the participants mentioned racism and discriminatory practices at least once during their session. A study with a focus on discriminatory practices in the workplace would provide more insight into matters concerning Black administrators and social justice. Even though this study did not focus on gender, I would venture to say a gender comparison study is warranted. Further research geared toward identifying challenges Black administrators contend with at all levels could be explored from a gender perspective. A gender focused study could bring awareness to the differences in the experiences of Black women as compared to Black men regarding career progression in higher education.

Just as there are barriers that may have inhibited career growth, there are supports that may have aided and assisted as well. Research that focuses on the factors that aid in the career progression of Black administrators would place a positive spin on the literature based on the topic. It is recommended that a study based on career aids or supports be conducted from the perspective of upper-level administrators. The perspectives of the participants could serve as a resource for those who are looking to overcome barriers that have been identified in this study.

Research relative to identifying a comprehensive list of supports and barriers to career progression in higher education for Black administrators could be informative. Such research could be conducted to project the voices of administrators who have first-hand knowledge of both sides of the coin. Drawing data on both the supports and barriers may be informative, thus adding to the discussion on their significance to career progression for Black administrators. From this study a list of “Dos and Don’ts” could be created and communicated as a “How to Guide” geared toward the career progression of Blacks in the academy.

Conclusion

According to Jackson and O’Callaghan (2009b) one of the most noticeable disparities in higher education is the inability of Blacks to advance in their careers at the same rate as their White counterparts. Research has shown that it is important for students of color to be able to identify with others from their racial groups, especially in leadership positions. To address a growing diverse student body, there must be a commitment to increasing the presence of Blacks in leadership positions throughout the academy. The purpose of this study was to examine Black administrators’ attitudes and perspectives regarding the accessibility and attainment of executive-level administrative opportunities. More specifically, the subjective way Black administrators view possibilities of advancing beyond mid-level administrative positions was sought.

To understand the subjective viewpoints of 40 Black mid-level administrators regarding career progression in higher education, Q methodology was used. After sorting a 41 statement Q sample, five factors emerged outlining the perspectives of the participants. The five emergent factors were named: *Factor 1: The Disconnected*, *Factor 2: The Disadvantaged*, *Factor 3: The Discriminated*, *Factor 4: The Dismissed*, and *Factor 5: The Disinterested*.

This study identified different categories of administrators holding different perspectives regarding challenges and barriers to career progression. Each group of participants posed viable explanations for why their career had not progressed beyond mid-level administration. Whether they believed they were the victim of their circumstances or of the system, they all found validity in their perceptions.

APPENDICES A-N

Appendix A: Participant Solicitation Letter-Interview and Questionnaire

Participant Solicitation Letter- Interview and Questionnaire

An Invitation to Participate in a Research Study:

"Examining Perceptions of Black Administrators in Higher Education Regarding Administrative Leadership Opportunities"

Principal Investigator: Renita Taylor Thompson, M. Ed.

Dissertation Chair: Dr. Chris Janson

Dear Prospective Research Participant:

My name is Renita Taylor Thompson and I am a doctoral candidate at the University of North Florida in the College of Education and Human Services. Under the direction of Dr. Chris Janson, I am currently embarking on research for my dissertation. I invite you to participate in a study entitled "Examining Perceptions of Black Administrators in Higher Education Regarding Administrative Leadership Opportunities". The purpose of this study is to understand how Black administrators perceive and view career advancement opportunities in higher education. I am interested in the subjective viewpoints of Black mid-level administrators as it relates to the accessibility and attainment of upper-level administrative positions.

For this study, participants must be African American/Black professionals who are employed by a public, bachelor's degree granting, predominately white institution of higher education in the state of Florida. Participants must also be in a mid-level administrative position as determined by your institution, and hold at least a master's degree. You have been identified as a prospective research participant for this study because you meet the aforementioned requirements.

If you choose to participate in this study, your involvement will include taking part in a semi-structured interview and filling out a demographic questionnaire. The average interview is estimated to last from 30-60 minutes; therefore, interviews will be scheduled in 60 minute blocks. Each participant will also complete a questionnaire at the conclusion of their interview, which will take approximately 20 minutes to complete. Interviews will be scheduled at your convenience, and held at your institution or a more discrete location of your choosing. During the interview you will be asked questions regarding your education and work history, age, ethnicity, and career mobility experience. In addition to taking handwritten notes, with your permission, two audio recording devices will be used for transcription and translation purposes. You may also be asked to attend an additional session or follow-up telephone conversation if clarification of any of your responses is needed. Unless otherwise noted, email correspondence may be used to contact you throughout the duration of the study.

Your participation is completely voluntary; you may withdraw at any time during the process. Please note, no personal identifiable information will be used to formulate or compose any data reports. Responses will be kept confidential. For data security purposes, any data in electronic form will be securely stored under password protection. Information gathered (interview

UNF IRB Number: 830044-2 Approval Date: 01-06-2016 Expiration Date: 01-06-2017 Processed on behalf of UNF's IRB <i>KLC</i>

responses, demographic profiles, and researcher notes) during this study will remain on a secure server at the University of North Florida. Upon the completion of a study, UNF's policy requires data be maintained for a period of three years at which time, they may be destroyed. There are no foreseeable risks, direct benefits, or compensation for participating in this Q sort and follow-up survey. By participating in this research study, you will help foster an understanding of perceptions and views toward Black administrators' career progression in higher education. If you choose to participate, please know that your time will be greatly appreciated.

The University of North Florida, Institutional Review Board has approved this research study. If you have any questions regarding your rights as a participant, please contact the University of North Florida's Institutional Review Board directly at [REDACTED] or via email at [REDACTED].

Should you have any questions or would like to participate, upon receipt of this letter, please contact me directly at [REDACTED] or send an email to [REDACTED]. You may also contact my dissertation chair, Dr. Chris Janson, at [REDACTED] or send an email to [REDACTED].

Thank you in advance for your interest and consideration.

Sincerely,

Renita T. Thompson, M. Ed.

Doctoral Candidate
The University of North Florida



UNF IRB Number: 830044-2
Approval Date: 01-06-2016
Expiration Date: 01-06-2017
Processed on behalf of UNF's IRB <i>KLC</i>

Appendix B: Participant Solicitation Letter-Q Sample**Participant Solicitation Letter- Q Sample****An Invitation to Participate in a Research Study:**

"Examining Perceptions of Black Administrators in Higher Education Regarding Administrative Leadership Opportunities"

Principal Investigator: Renita Taylor Thompson, M. Ed.

Dissertation Chair: Dr. Chris Janson

Dear Prospective Research Participant:

My name is Renita Taylor Thompson and I am a doctoral candidate at the University of North Florida in the College of Education and Human Services. Under the direction of Dr. Chris Janson, I am currently embarking on research for my dissertation. I invite you to participate in a study entitled "Examining Perceptions of Black Administrators in Higher Education Regarding Administrative Leadership Opportunities". The purpose of this study is to understand how Black administrators perceive and view career advancement opportunities in higher education. I am interested in the subjective viewpoints of Black mid-level administrators as it relates to the accessibility and attainment of upper-level administrative positions.

For this study, participants must be African American/Black professionals who are employed by a public, bachelor's degree granting, predominately white institution of higher education in the state of Florida. Participants must also be in a mid-level administrative position as determined by your institution, and hold at least a master's degree. You have been identified as a prospective research participant for this study because you meet the aforementioned requirements.

If you choose to participate in this study, your involvement will include ranking and sorting the research instrument (Q sample) and filling out a post sorting demographic questionnaire. The Q sorting process will take approximately 45 minutes to complete. The post sorting questionnaire will take approximately an additional 20 minutes to complete.

Your participation is completely voluntary; you may withdraw at any time during the process. Please note, no personal identifiable information will be used to formulate or compose any data reports. Responses will be anonymous and kept confidential. For data security purposes, any data in electronic form will be securely stored under password protection. Information gathered (interview responses, demographic profiles, and researcher notes) during this study will remain on a secure server at the University of North Florida. Upon the completion of a study, UNF's policy requires data be maintained for a period of three years at which time, they may be destroyed. There are no foreseeable risks, direct benefits, or compensation for participating in this Q sort and follow-up survey. By participating in this research study, you will help foster an understanding of perceptions and views toward Black administrators' career progression in higher education. If you choose to participate, please know that your time will be greatly appreciated.

UNF IRB Number: 830044-2 Approval Date: 01-06-2016 Expiration Date: 01-06-2017 Processed on behalf of UNF's IRB <i>KLC</i>

The University of North Florida, Institutional Review Board has approved this research study. If you have any questions regarding your rights as a participant, please contact the University of North Florida's Institutional Review Board directly at [REDACTED] or via email at [REDACTED]. Should you have any questions, please feel free to contact me directly at [REDACTED] or Dr. Chris Janson at [REDACTED].

Upon receipt of this letter, please email ([REDACTED]) to indicate whether or not you are interested in participating in this study. Once your response has been received, further information with complete instructions will follow.

Thank you in advance for your interest and consideration.

Sincerely,

Renita T. Thompson, M. Ed.
Principal Investigator
[REDACTED]

UNF IRB Number: 830044-2
Approval Date: 01-06-2016
Expiration Date: 01-06-2017
Processed on behalf of UNF's IRB *KLC*

Appendix C: Informed Consent Agreement for Study Participation

Informed Consent Agreement for Study Participation

“Examining Perceptions of Black Administrators in Higher Education Regarding Administrative Leadership Opportunities”

Principal Investigator: Renita Taylor Thompson

Dissertation Chair: Dr. Chris Janson

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to understand how Black administrators perceive and view career advancement opportunities in higher education. I am interested in the subjective viewpoints of Black mid-level administrators as it relates to the accessibility and attainment of upper-level administrative positions.

You must be 18 years of age or older to take part in this research study. If you agree to take part in this study, you will participate in a 30-60 minute semi-structured interview at an agreed upon time and place. You will be asked a number of open-ended questions about your professional experiences working in higher education. If it is agreed that we need to continue the interview discussion past the allotted time, a determination will be made at that time. You may be contacted via email or telephone for clarification or follow-up questions. Two audio recording devices will be used during the interview, with your permission; however, you may opt not to be recorded. This will not preclude you from participating with the study. The audio recordings will be kept securely stored in a locked cabinet owned by the researcher.

Benefits of the Study

While there may not be a direct benefit from completing interviews, your participation in this study may offer the opportunity to consider and articulate, without restriction, your experiences and perceptions. Personal reflections that may emerge during the interview may help foster an understanding of perceptions and views held by Black administrators working in higher education.

Results from this study will be reported in the completed dissertation, professional presentations, and other appropriate professional publications. Please note, no personal individually identifiable information will be used in my dissertation or any of the publications, presentations, or reports that result from this research.

Risks of the Study

There may be minimal risks associated with participating in this study. Risks associated with this study will be no greater than what is expected during a normal conversation. An accidental breach of confidentiality could lead to personal thoughts being revealed. You may feel uncomfortable thinking about or talking about personal experiences related to race and the workplace. You may opt out of the study at any point without penalty.

Alternative Treatments

There are no procedures or treatments associated with this study.

Confidentiality

Your participation in this research study will be kept confidential. Every attempt will be made to protect your privacy. That means that your name will not appear on any papers on which this information is recorded. It is understood that a person of influence, such as yourself, may not feel comfortable responding to questions that explore issues related to race and the workplace. To address this, pseudonyms will be assigned. The researcher will keep a master list of pseudonyms and their corresponding responses securely stored. Your identity will not be revealed in any publication that might result from this study. For data security purposes, information gathered (interview responses, demographic profiles, and researcher notes) during this study will remain on a secure server at the University of North Florida. Upon the completion of a study, UNF's policy requires data be maintained for a period of three years at which time, they may be destroyed.

Withdrawal

Your participation is completely voluntary; you may refuse to participate or quit at any time during the study without prejudice or penalty.

Costs and Compensation

There are no costs associated with participating in this study. Participants will also not be compensated for participating in this study.

Questions

If you have any questions or concerns about this study, you may contact Renita Thompson at [REDACTED] or Dr. Chris Janson at [REDACTED]. You may also contact The University of North Florida Institutional Review Board at [REDACTED] with any concerns you may have concerning your rights as a participant.

Consent to Participate

This agreement states that you have read and understand the above information and been provided with a copy of this informed consent. Your signature below indicates that you agree to participate in this study with the understanding that you may choose to stop participating at any time without prejudice or penalty.

☐ Please check the box if you wish to opt not to be recorded during the interview process.

Signature of Participant

Date

Name of Participant (print)

Signature of Researcher

Date

Appendix D: Informed Consent Agreement for Study Participation-Q Sort*Informed Consent Agreement for Study Participation -Q Sort***“Examining Perceptions of Black Administrators in Higher Education Regarding Administrative Leadership Opportunities”**

Principal Investigator: Renita Taylor Thompson

Dissertation Chair: Dr. Chris Janson

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to understand how Black administrators perceive and view career advancement opportunities in higher education. I am interested in the subjective viewpoints of Black mid-level administrators as it relates to the accessibility and attainment of upper-level administrative positions.

You must be 18 years of age or older to take part in this research study. If you agree to take part in this study, you will complete the Q Sort and Post Sort Questionnaire. The Q sort and Post Sort Questionnaire will be sent to you electronically via email. This process will take approximately 1 hour.

Benefits of the Study

Although there are no direct benefits associated with participating in the study, your participation in this study may offer the opportunity to discuss your perceptions and views by identifying factors that may impede career progression. Personal reflections that may emerge could potentially help foster an understanding of perceptions and views held by Black administrators working in higher education.

Results from this study will be reported in the completed dissertation, professional presentations, and other appropriate professional publications. Please note, no personal individually identifiable information will be used in my dissertation or any of the publications, presentations, or reports that result from this research.

Risks of the Study

There are no known risks associated with this study.

Alternative Treatments

There are no procedures or treatments associated with this study.

Confidentiality

Your participation in this research study will be kept confidential. The information gathered during the study will be kept confidential and every attempt will be made to protect your privacy. Also, your name will not be associated with any of the Q sorts and questionnaires. For data security purposes, any data in electronic form will be securely stored under password protection. Information gathered during this study will remain on a secure server at the

University of North Florida. Your identity will not be revealed in any publication that might result from this study.

Withdrawal

Your participation is completely voluntary; you may refuse to participate or quit at any time during the study without prejudice or penalty.

Costs and Compensation

There are no costs associated with participating in this study. Participants will also not be compensated for participating in this study.

Questions

If you have any questions or concerns about this study, you may contact Renita Thompson at [REDACTED] or Dr. Chris Janson at [REDACTED]. You may also contact The University of North Florida Institutional Review Board at [REDACTED] with any concerns you may have concerning your rights as a participant.

Consent to Participate

This agreement states that you have read and understand the above information and been provided with a copy of this informed consent. Please click the link below to begin the Q Sorting Process. Prior to the sorting process, you will be asked to check a box indicating that you have read this consent letter and agree to participate in this research study. If you are disinterested, you can simply close the web browser. The research instrument will not launch until the box has been checked. Please print a copy of this letter to keep for your records.

Survey link:

<http://edutrope.phpwebhosting.com/Flashq-ThompsonR/>

Thank you for your time and participation.

Renita Taylor Thompson
Principle Investigator

Appendix E: Interview Protocol*Interview Protocol*

“Examining Perceptions of Black Administrators in Higher Education Regarding
Administrative Leadership Opportunities”

Principal Investigator: Renita Taylor Thompson

Dissertation Chair: Dr. Chris Janson

Dear Participant:

The purpose of this interview is to explore the perceived challenges or barriers to career advancement that Black administrators encounter in higher education. The interview questions were designed to examine your personal experiences as they relate to career progression and advancement. The information collected from this interview will be used to provide insights that could provide an understanding of perceptions and views held by Black administrators working in higher education. Thank you for your willingness to participate.

Begin the interview by telling the participant a little about the study and why I chose the study.

Starter Question: How would you describe your experience as an administrator working in higher education up to this point?

1. How do you self-identify racially?
2. Do you feel comfortable expressing your perspective even if it is not popular?
3. How did you decide to pursue a career in higher education?
4. Tell me about your academic preparation for your current position.
5. Are you interested in advancing from mid-level administration to upper-level administration?
6. If so, what have you done to prepare yourself?
7. What has had the greatest impact on your career mobility in higher education?
8. Do you believe that you have an equal opportunity when pursuing future positions?
9. Does your institution have any Black administrators in senior-level administrative positions?
10. How do you feel about where you are right now in your career?
11. Where does racism rank as a challenge to your career development?

12. Would you recommend working in higher education to other Black professionals?
13. In hindsight, what would you do differently if you were starting your career over today?

Appendix F: Q Sorting Grid and Instructions

Q Sorting Grid and Instructions

“Examining Perceptions of Black Administrators in Higher Education Regarding Administrative Leadership Opportunities”

Principal Investigator: Renita Taylor Thompson, M. Ed.

Dissertation Chair: Dr. Chris Janson

Thank you for your willingness to participate in this research study. During this process, you are to reflect on your experiences as an administrator in higher education.

You are being asked to read and respond to the statements by ranking them. You have 41 statement cards that you will be asked to rank order according to the items that you consider to be (+4) "MOST SIGNIFICANT" to your perspective on career progression in higher education to those that you consider to be (-4) "LEAST SIGNIFICANT" to your perspective on career progression in higher education.

Instructions:

1. First, read each statement carefully and sort the statements into three piles: “LEAST SIGNIFICANT”, “NEUTRAL”, and “MOST SIGNIFICANT”.
2. Second, use the sorting grid to sort all of the statements:
 - a. Take the three statements that you most agree with from the “LEAST SIGNIFICANT” pile and place them under the (-4) column and the three that you most agree with from the “MOST SIGNIFICANT” pile and place them under the (+4) column.
 - b. Working from the outside inward, continue on with this procedure for all statements in the “LEAST LIKE” and “MOST LIKE” piles, until finally the “NEUTRAL” statements can be arranged into the remaining open spaces on the grid.
3. Next, record the card numbers on the response grid
4. Finally, complete the Post Sort and Demographic Questionnaire

Response Grid

Least Significant

Neutral/Unsure

Most Significant

[illegible]

Appendix G: IRB Letter

Institutional Review Board Approval



MEMORANDUM

DATE: January 6, 2016

TO: Ms. Renita Thompson, M. Ed.

VIA: Dr. Chris Janson
Leadership, School Counseling & Sports Management

FROM: Dr. Jennifer Wesely, Chairperson
On behalf of the UNF Institutional Review Board

RE: Review of Revisions for New Project by the UNF Institutional Review Board IRB#830044-2:
"Examining Perceptions of Black Administrators in Higher Education Regarding Administrative Leadership Opportunities"

UNF IRB Number: 830044-2 Approval Date: 01-06-2016 Expiration Date: 01-06-2017 Processed on behalf of UNF's IRB <i>KLC</i>

This is to advise you that your project, "Examining Perceptions of Black Administrators in Higher Education Regarding Administrative Leadership Opportunities" underwent "[Expedited](#)" ([Categories 6 & 7](#)) review on behalf of the UNF Institutional Review Board. Your reviewer recommended approval without further modifications.

This approval applies to your project in the form and content as submitted to the IRB for review. All participants must receive a stamped and dated copy of the approved informed consent document when possible. Any variations or modifications to the approved procedures or documents must be cleared with the IRB prior to implementing such changes. *For example*, if you plan to make changes to your stamped and dated informed consent form, it will be necessary to submit a copy of the revised form via an amendment so that it can be reviewed and approved prior to use. Once approved, a new stamp and date will be included on the revised consent form so that it can be used. To submit an amendment, please complete an [Amendment Request Document](#) and submit it along with any updated documents affected by the changes via a new package in IRBNet. Any unanticipated problems involving risk and any occurrence of serious harm to subjects and others shall be reported by completing this [Event Report Form](#) and sending it promptly to the IRB within 3 business days.

Your study has been approved for a period of 12 months as of 01/06/2016. If you would like your project to continue for more than one year, you will be required to provide a completed [Status Report](#) and other continuing review documentation to the UNF IRB prior to 12/06/2016. An extension will be necessary if your study will be continuing past the 1-year anniversary of the approval date. *We ask that you submit your status*

report and other continuing review information 30 days before the expiration date as noted above to allow time for review and processing. When you are ready to close your project, please complete a [Closing Report Form](#). Please note that it will be necessary to create a new package in IRBNet in order to submit amendments, status reports, or closing reports in the future. All applicable records relating to this research shall be retained for at least 3 years after completion of the research.

CITI Course Completion Reports are valid for 3 years. Your completion report is valid through 10/31/2018, Dr. Janson's completion report is valid through 11/08/2018, and Dr. Maxis' completion report is valid through 06/16/2017. The CITI training for renewal will become available 90 days before the current CITI training expires. Please renew your CITI training when necessary and ensure that all key personnel maintain current CITI training. Individuals can access CITI by following this link: <http://www.citiprogram.org/>. Should you have questions regarding your project or any other IRB issues, please contact the research integrity unit of the Office of Research and Sponsored Programs by emailing [REDACTED].

This letter has been electronically signed in accordance with all applicable regulations, and a copy is retained within UNF's records. All records shall be accessible for inspection and copying by authorized representatives of the department or agency at reasonable times and in a reasonable manner. A copy of this approval may also be sent to the dean and/or chair of your department.

Appendix H: Demographic Information Questionnaire

Demographic Information Questionnaire

“Examining Perceptions of Black Administrators in Higher Education Regarding
Administrative Leadership Opportunities”

Principal Investigator: Renita Taylor Thompson, M. Ed.

Dissertation Chair: Dr. Chris Janson

Dear Research Participant:

Thank you for taking the time to respond to this brief questionnaire as part of a dissertation research study focusing on Black administrators in higher education. Your identity and responses will remain confidential. Please **DO NOT** place your name or any identifying information on the questionnaire (e.g. department, name of school, etc.). It should take no longer than 20 minutes to complete the following questions. Please send the completed questionnaire back via mail in the stamped, self-addressed envelope that was provided. Please **DO NOT** add a return address to the envelope. Please make sure to make a copy of the completed questionnaire to keep for your records. Thank you.

From your perspective as a Black administrator, what are some unique challenges that could potentially impede your career progression or advancement in higher education?

(Please list and describe up to eight)

1.	
2.	
3.	
4.	
5.	
6.	
7.	
8.	

SECTION A: PERSONAL INFORMATION

1. What is your Gender? (check one)

_____ Female

_____ Male

2. How would you classify your Ethnicity? (please choose any or all that apply)

_____ African American or Black

_____ American Indian

_____ Asian

_____ Caucasian or White

_____ Hispanic

_____ Latino

_____ Pacific Islander or Hawaiian Native

_____ Other

3. Do you have a professional mentor or coach?

_____ Yes

_____ No

4. Do you belong to any professional committees/organizations/associations?

_____ Yes

_____ No

SECTION B: EDUCATIONAL INFORMATION

5. What is the highest degree you have earned?

_____ Master's

_____ Doctorate

_____ Other (please specify) _____

6. What type of undergraduate institution did you attend?

_____ Historically Black College or University (HBCU)

_____ Predominantly White Institution (PWI)

7. Was your undergraduate institution Private or Public?

_____ Private

_____ Public

8. What type of graduate institution did you attend?

_____ Historically Black College or University (HBCU)

_____ Predominantly White Institution (PWI)

9. Was your graduate institution Private or Public?

_____ Private

_____ Public

10. What type of doctoral institution did you attend?

_____ Historically Black College or University (HBCU)

_____ Predominantly White Institution (PWI)

11. Was your doctoral institution Private or Public?

_____ Private

_____ Public

SECTION C: EMPLOYMENT INFORMATION

12. How long have you been working at your current institution?

_____ Less than 5 years

_____ 5-9 years

_____ 10-14 years

_____ 15-19 years

_____ 20 years or more

13. How long have you been working in an administrative level position?

_____ Less than 5 years

- _____ 5-9 years
- _____ 10-14 years
- _____ 15-19 years
- _____ 20 years or more

14. Which category does your current position fall under?

- _____ Academic Affairs
- _____ Administrative Affairs
- _____ Alumni Relations
- _____ Enrollment Management
- _____ Student Affairs
- _____ Other (please specify) _____

15. What is your current title?

Appendix I: Communication Concourse*Communication Concourse*

1. Mentorship is important to career development, in its absence a career path will become stagnant (Reichert, 1994).
2. One of the most effective training strategies for gaining valuable work skills is using a buddy or mentoring system (Reichert, 1994).
3. Groups whose status in the institution is constrained by race, gender, or age are likely to experience significantly less career mobility (Sagaria, 2002).
4. Subtle acts of racisms can have a huge impact on career progression for Black administrators in the academy (Davis, 2005).
5. Lack of diversity in upper-level administration is due to weak or indifferent recruitment practice (Phelps & Taber, 1996).
6. Candidates of color are subjected to a system of discriminative filtering that undermines their potential and credibility as candidates for positions in PWIs (Sagaria, 2002).
7. Black administrators are held to a higher set of standards than their White counterparts (Patitu & Hinton, 2003).
8. It is a form of racism when diversity related leadership positions such as Director of the Multicultural Center for Counseling are created for minorities to fill (Jackson, 2004).
9. Being accepted by their White counterparts, in Predominantly White Institutions, is an ongoing issue for Black administrators (Rolle, Davies, & Banning, 2000).
10. For fear of being labeled as the “token” Black administrators will refrain from pursuing career advancement opportunities (Patitu & Hinton, 2003)

11. Lack of physical mobility (movement from one employer to another)
12. Lack of mentors and/or coaches
13. Lack of involvement in institutional affairs
14. Lack of involvement in community engagement/networking
15. Lack of degree attainment
16. Lack of Successories (skillset & strengthening)
17. Not willing to listen to constructive feedback
18. Being heard in the professional environment while competing with other minority groups
19. Pressure to conform in an ethnically normed environment
20. Pressure to "over perform" in order to be seen as adequate or capable
21. Lack of understanding of "affect", in that business tone does not reflect anger or hostility
22. Not "fitting" in with the dominate culture
23. Age
24. Constant shifts in focus and priorities within institutions
25. Administration's poor crisis management
26. Responsibilities caring for children as well as parents or extended family
27. Current composition of positions in department
28. Current dispositions/personalities of staff in department
29. Constantly changing regulations that make it difficult for campus partners to understand and collaborate with the department
30. Stringent regulations that make it difficult for the department to be perceived as "student-

friendly”

31. Blacks’ passion can be mistaken for emotions. The fear of our emotions can cause apprehension when being considered for a promotion
32. The lack of good contacts
33. The inability to master the level where you are can cause your growth to be stunted
34. Bad reputations can work against you
35. Not being in the right place at the right time
36. Putting all of your "stock" in other minorities helping you to advance
37. No one to relate to, feelings of isolation and loneliness
38. Made to feel like they’re incompetent and incapable of completing menial tasks
39. No support from home encouraging career progression
40. Lack of time to devote to pursuing what is required to advance
41. Refusal to buy into the office games
42. Do not agree with current leadership’s agenda
43. Finding mentors who understands your position
44. Working for employers who are not aware that you are looking to advance
45. Need to be strategic in making certain relationship
46. Working for employers who are not liberal and forward thinking could hinder advancement
47. Lack of commitment to diversity
48. Having to prove yourself
49. Learning to “toot your own horn”
50. Apprehension due to fear of being ostracized by peers

51. Lack of on the job training
52. No motivation
53. Low morale
54. Have the aptitude but lack the experience
55. No one to speak up as a reference
56. Burnt bridges with previous employers who would serve as a poor reference
57. Black women not being supportive
58. Jealous and envious tendencies “crabs in the bucket” syndrome
59. Relationships should be forged outside of the office and after working hours
60. Being granted access to the "inner circles"/ goes beyond networking
61. Making a name for yourself
62. Mastering your craft
63. Self- expectations
64. Outgrowing current job duties and needed more challenges
65. Relationships with peers who noticed exceptional job performance
66. Organizational culture changes
67. Organizational structure changes
68. Having a mentor
69. Seeking access to professional affiliations
70. Joining social support groups with like-minded professionals
71. Sharing plans with contacts inside and outside of your organization
72. Strength from within
73. Exposure to broad-based experiences

- 74. Mobility- the willingness to move for advancement
- 75. Ability to communicate to broad audiences
- 76. Multi-faceted
- 77. Thick-skinned
- 78. Long-standing solid relationships in various communities
- 79. A mentor showing me the ropes/processing situations
- 80. Taking a risk with new experiences
- 81. Involvement in the profession outside of the job
- 82. Willingness to relocate for a job
- 83. Building my work ethic and job reputation 1st before doing more outside the job
- 84. Great supervisor who would push and challenge me
- 85. Networking with others outside of institution organization
- 86. Strong work ethic-kept my word, dressed appropriately, completed tasks in a timely manner
- 87. Always being viewed as combative or confrontational
- 88. Inflexible, not willing to conform or change who you are
- 89. Don't want to conform to the office culture or politics
- 90. White people who has not taken the time to understand people of color.

Appendix J: Q Sample*Q Sample*

1. My college/university does not have a formal mentoring system in place.
2. I am not able to communicate effectively due to cultural differences
3. I am not willing to “sell-out” or conform.
4. I have worked (or am currently working) for unstable organizations with constant turnover amongst leadership.
5. My college/university is not progressive or forward thinking.
6. It’s a challenge for me to trust that the feedback I receive is constructive and so I sometimes don’t take it very well.
7. My reputation seems to be tainted and it proceeds me.
8. I am not yet sufficiently proficient in my current role.
9. I do not have a network of professionals outside of my own university/college.
10. I have not been able to develop strategic relationships with people who can help me advance my career.
11. I don’t feel my peers support me.
12. I am held back by the pressure to outperform even the highest expectations in order to be viewed simply as adequate.
13. I have not yet been able to acquire sufficient experience.
14. The priorities of my college/university are constantly shifting.
15. I have been unwilling or reluctant to relocate in order to advance professionally.
16. I haven’t been able to strike the right work-home balance.
17. I do not have social support outside of work.

18. I haven't found other people of color in my college/university who are willing to assist me or look out for my best interests.
19. I work (or have worked) for leaders who do not value their employees' career advancement.
20. I do not see other people of color in the higher administrative levels so I haven't sought advancement opportunities for fear of not "fitting in."
21. I have gotten to the point where I do not believe I will succeed in my efforts to advance.
22. I do not yet have the credentials or degree to be successful
23. I am not privy to the unwritten rules or hidden curriculum of a predominantly white institution and that hinders my progression.
24. I simply do not have access to the inner circles of leadership in my predominantly white institution.
25. I do not want to be labeled as a "token"
26. I have not shared my plans to advance with leadership; therefore, they are unaware of my aspirations.
27. Sometimes, I wonder if I have not developed a thick enough skin to navigate a predominantly white institution.
28. I have become too content in my current position.
29. I do not practice self-market and self-promote like I should
30. I am often mistaken for being combative and aggressive, whereas white colleagues are perceived as being passionate.
31. I have not been in the right place at the right time
32. I am held to higher standard as a person of color.

- 33. There is a lack of commitment to diversity in my institution
- 34. I am not a risk taker and can be afraid of trying.
- 35. I have to compete with other minorities for the limited positions open to us.
- 36. I have experienced systemic prejudices and racism.
- 37. I refuse to engage in office politics
- 38. My advancement has been limited to diversity related positions
- 39. It's been difficult for me to constantly "code switch" in a predominantly white work environment.
- 40. I think my age has held me back
- 41. I work in a college/university that just doesn't understand people of color.

Appendix K: Post-Sort Questionnaire*Post Sort/Demographic Questionnaire**“Examining Perceptions of Black Administrators in Higher Education
Regarding Administrative Leadership Opportunities”***Please answer the following Post-Sort Questions:**

1. Tell me about the statements you placed in the (+4) “MOST SIGNIFICANT” column. What do those statements mean to you?

2. Tell me about the statements you placed in the (-4) “LEAST SIGNIFICANT” column. What do those statements mean to you?

SECTION A: PERSONAL INFORMATION

16. What is your Gender? (check one)

_____ Female

_____ Male

17. How would you classify your Ethnicity? (please choose any or all that apply)

_____ African American or Black

_____ American Indian

_____ Asian

_____ Caucasian or White

_____ Hispanic

_____ Latino

_____ Pacific Islander or Hawaiian Native

_____ Other

18. Do you have a professional mentor or coach?

_____ Yes

_____ No

19. Do you belong to any professional committees/organizations/associations?

_____ Yes

_____ No

SECTION B: EDUCATIONAL INFORMATION

20. What is the highest degree you have earned?

_____ Master's

_____ Doctorate

_____ Other (please specify) _____

21. What type of undergraduate institution did you attend?

_____ Historically Black College or University (HBCU)

_____ Predominantly White Institution (PWI)

22. Was your undergraduate institution Private or Public?

_____ Private

_____ Public

23. What type of graduate institution did you attend?

_____ Historically Black College or University (HBCU)

_____ Predominantly White Institution (PWI)

24. Was your graduate institution Private or Public?

_____ Private

_____ Public

25. What type of doctoral institution did you attend?

_____ Historically Black College or University (HBCU)

_____ Predominantly White Institution (PWI)

26. Was your doctoral institution Private or Public?

_____ Private

_____ Public

SECTION C: EMPLOYMENT INFORMATION

27. How long have you been working at your current institution?

_____ Less than 5 years

_____ 5-9 years

_____ 10-14 years

_____ 15-19 years

_____ 20 years or more

28. How long have you been working in an administrative level position?

_____ Less than 5 years

_____ 5-9 years

_____ 10-14 years

_____ 15-19 years

_____ 20 years or more

29. Which category does your current position fall under?

_____ Academic Affairs

_____ Administrative Affairs

_____ Alumni Relations

_____ Enrollment Management

_____ Student Affairs

_____ Other (please specify) _____

Appendix L: Participant Demographic Information

Participant Demographic Information

Participant	Pseudonym	State	Sex	Age	Education	Mentoring	Prof Affiliation	Undergrad Inst.	Master's Inst.	Doctoral Inst.	Duration of Employment	Total Years in Admin	Category of Position
1	FLM47D	FL	Male	47	Doctoral	No	Yes	PWI	PWI	PWI	Less than 5 years	Less than 5 years	Student Affairs
2	FLM48M	FL	Male	48	Masters	No	Yes	HBCU	HBCU	X	Less than 5 years	Less than 5 years	Student Affairs
3	FLF49D	FL	Female	49	Doctoral	No	No	PWI	PWI	PWI	5-9 years	15-19 years	Administrative Affairs
4	FLF36M	FL	Female	36	Masters	No	No	PWI	Other	X	Less than 5 years	10-14 years	Administrative Affairs
5	FLF29M	FL	Female	29	Masters	Yes	Yes	PWI	PWI	X	Less than 5 years	Less than 5 years	Student Affairs
6	FLF34M	FL	Female	34	Masters	Yes	Yes	PWI	PWI	X	Less than 5 years	10-14 years	Enrollment Services
7	FLF47M	FL	Female	47	Masters	Yes	Yes	HBCU	PWI	X	15-19 years	10-14 years	Other
8	FLM38O	FL	Male	38	Other	Yes	Yes	HBCU	PWI	X	Less than 5 years	10-14 years	Administrative Affairs
9	FLF37M	FL	Female	37	Masters	No	Yes	PWI	PWI	X	10-14 years	10-14 years	Student Affairs
10	FLF34M	FL	Female	34	Masters	No	Yes	PWI	PWI	X	Less than 5 years	5-9 years	Student Affairs
11	FLF39M	FL	Female	39	Masters	No	Yes	PWI	PWI	X	Less than 5 years	15-19 years	Enrollment Services
12	FLF33M	FL	Female	33	Masters	Yes	Yes	PWI	PWI	X	Less than 5 years	5-9 years	Student Affairs
13	FLM49D	FL	Male	49	Doctoral	Yes	Yes	HBCU	PWI	PWI	Less than 5 years	20 or more years	Administrative Affairs
14	FLM36D	FL	Male	36	Doctoral	No	Yes	PWI	PWI	PWI	5-9 years	5-9 years	Administrative Affairs
15	FLF30M	FL	Female	30	Masters	Yes	Yes	PWI	PWI	X	Less than 5 years	5-9 years	Academic Affairs
16	NCF37M	NC	Female	37	Masters	Yes	Yes	HBCU	PWI	X	5-9 years	10-14 years	Student Affairs
17	VAM34O	VA	Male	34	Other	Yes	Yes	PWI	PWI	X	10-14 years	Less than 5 years	Administrative Affairs
18	FLM26M	FL	Male	26	Masters	Yes	Yes	PWI	PWI	X	Less than 5 years	5-9 years	Enrollment Services
19	VAF30M	VA	Female	30	Masters	Yes	No	PWI	PWI	X	5-9 years	Less than 5 years	Enrollment Services
20	FLM39M	FL	Male	39	Masters	No	Yes	PWI	PWI	X	5-9 years	10-14 years	Student Affairs
21	TXF41M	TX	Female	41	Masters	Yes	Yes	PWI	PWI	X	Less than 5 years	5-9 years	Administrative Affairs
22	FLF42M	FL	Female	42	Masters	No	No	PWI	PWI	X	Less than 5 years	Less than 5 years	Student Affairs
23	FLF50S	FL	Female	50	Ed. Specialist	Yes	Yes	HBCU	PWI	X	Less than 5 years	5-9 years	Academic Affairs
24	FLF32O	FL	Female	32	Other	Yes	Yes	PWI	Other	X	5-9 years	5-9 years	Enrollment Services
25	FLF37Ma	FL	Female	37	Masters	No	No	PWI	PWI	X	Less than 5 years	10-14 years	Student Affairs
26	FLF37Mb	FL	Female	37	Masters	No	No	PWI	PWI	X	Less than 5 years	10-14 years	Student Affairs
27	FLF37Mc	FL	Female	37	Masters	No	Yes	HBCU	HBCU	X	Less than 5 years	5-9 years	Student Affairs
28	NCF32M	NC	Female	32	Masters	Yes	Yes	HBCU	PWI	X	Less than 5 years	5-9 years	Administrative Affairs
29	FLM34D	FL	Male	34	Doctoral	No	Yes	PWI	HBCU	HBCU	5-9 years	5-9 years	Student Affairs
30	NCM48M	NC	Male	48	Masters	Yes	Yes	HBCU	PWI	X	Less than 5 years	10-14 years	Other
31	FLF44D	FL	Female	44	Doctoral	No	Yes	PWI	PWI	PWI	20 or more years	15-19 years	Administrative Affairs
32	FLM35M	FL	Male	35	Masters	No	Yes	PWI	PWI	X	Less than 5 years	Less than 5 years	Administrative Affairs
33	FLM42D	FL	Male	42	Doctoral	Yes	Yes	HBCU	PWI	PWI	5-9 years	10-14 years	Academic Affairs
34	FLF53M	FL	Female	53	Masters	No	Yes	HBCU	PWI	X	Less than 5 years	Less than 5 years	Student Affairs
35	FLF56O	FL	Female	56	Other	No	Yes	PWI	PWI	X	5-9 years	5-9 years	Administrative Affairs
36	FLF46M	FL	Female	46	Masters	No	Yes	HBCU	PWI	X	10-14 years	10-14 years	Academic Affairs
37	FLF39D	FL	Female	39	Doctoral	Yes	Yes	PWI	PWI	PWI	5-9 years	Less than 5 years	Academic Affairs
38	TXF57D	TX	Female	57	Doctoral	Yes	Yes	PWI	HBCU	PWI	Less than 5 years	5-9 years	Academic Affairs
39	TXF52D	TX	Female	52	Doctoral	No	Yes	PWI	PWI	PWI	Less than 5 years	5-9 years	Administrative Affairs
40	GAF42M	GA	Female	42	Masters	No	Yes	PWI	PWI	X	10-14 years	15-19 years	Academic Affairs

Appendix M: Correlation Matrix*Correlation Matrix*

SORTS	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30
1FLM47D	100	61	28	30	-35	-9	-29	22	37	50	-14	37	30	54	35	27	8	41	14	29	24	-18	-16	27	-13	7	21	0	31	-2
2 FLM48M	61	100	31	29	-16	-2	-22	5	22	51	-7	29	36	21	43	18	5	36	33	27	48	-30	17	1	0	38	20	-1	44	2
3 FLF49D	28	31	100	47	-11	6	10	-2	26	27	0	18	9	36	6	0	-17	21	10	36	-3	-6	-7	-3	-4	24	-7	9	35	-3
4 FLF36M	30	29	47	100	-3	-16	25	9	43	29	13	19	10	33	34	1	13	15	18	27	19	25	26	-12	13	31	20	24	30	7
5 FLF29M	-35	-16	-11	-3	100	2	28	-13	-11	-19	30	-9	-4	-23	17	-15	3	-15	9	-9	12	32	34	-24	2	16	-1	5	-10	6
6 FLF34M	-9	-2	6	-16	2	100	-6	-29	28	7	-3	-22	23	11	-6	24	3	16	-21	28	-6	-1	-23	3	30	-1	-3	-19	-4	3
7 FLF47M	-29	-22	10	25	28	-6	100	2	-4	-18	23	4	0	14	-10	-6	5	0	-3	27	-14	44	10	-24	17	-2	2	37	-3	24
8 FLM38O	22	5	-2	9	-13	-29	2	100	8	6	-2	25	-11	5	31	15	11	17	17	5	18	-4	32	28	1	20	17	35	-8	-8
9 FLF37M	37	22	26	43	-11	28	-4	8	100	42	26	33	33	62	22	26	21	43	-4	60	3	11	3	10	6	-1	5	17	33	0
10 FLF34M	50	51	27	29	-19	7	-18	6	42	100	10	41	29	44	49	20	2	66	32	43	11	-20	-11	19	-12	26	13	4	45	-2
11 FLF39M	-14	-7	0	13	30	-3	23	-2	26	10	100	45	0	9	13	-21	21	14	-5	10	-13	35	20	-19	-2	17	8	-5	20	-1
12 FLF33M	37	29	18	19	-9	-22	4	25	33	41	45	100	14	40	23	17	26	35	8	14	-3	15	14	7	-4	5	-6	10	55	-6
13 FLM49D	30	36	9	10	-4	23	0	-11	33	29	0	14	100	43	20	19	17	29	13	28	7	-28	1	-2	12	-3	49	4	41	8
14 FLM36D	54	21	36	33	-23	11	14	5	62	44	9	40	43	100	9	34	24	39	10	59	-1	1	-3	16	-14	-25	8	11	17	1
15 FLF30M	35	43	6	34	17	-6	-10	31	22	49	13	23	20	9	100	-6	5	42	30	10	39	-13	17	18	-1	39	39	5	41	0
16 NCF37M	27	18	0	1	-15	24	-6	15	26	20	-21	17	19	34	-6	100	39	21	0	23	4	0	12	18	16	-3	-12	5	-1	-1
17 VAM34O	8	5	-17	13	3	3	5	11	21	2	21	26	17	24	5	39	100	25	-14	13	-2	18	21	-16	34	6	7	-3	-1	4
18 FLM26M	41	36	21	15	-15	16	0	17	43	66	14	35	29	39	42	21	25	100	0	43	14	-26	-23	18	4	17	32	11	39	12
19 VAF30M	14	33	10	18	9	-21	-3	17	-4	32	-5	8	13	10	30	0	-14	0	100	14	10	-19	19	21	-25	20	2	-2	9	15
20 FLM39M	29	27	36	27	-9	28	27	5	60	43	10	14	28	59	10	23	13	43	14	100	-6	0	-6	-2	15	-2	4	23	19	10
21 TXF41M	24	48	-3	19	12	-6	-14	18	3	11	-13	-3	7	-1	39	4	-2	14	10	-6	100	-28	47	8	-15	8	16	3	-9	-12
22 FLF42M	-18	-30	-6	25	32	-1	44	-4	11	-20	35	15	-28	1	-13	0	18	-26	-19	0	-28	100	12	-21	40	20	-29	-15	-9	13
23 FLF50S	-16	17	-7	26	34	-23	10	32	3	-11	20	14	1	-3	17	12	21	-23	19	-6	47	12	100	-1	8	18	-4	20	-18	5

EXAMINING PERCEPTIONS OF BLACK

174

24 FLF320 27 1 -3 -12 -24 3 -24 28 10 19 -19 7 -2 16 18 18 -16 18 21 -2 8 -21 -1 100 -12 -6 -2 -17 -3 -26

SORTS	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30
25 FLF37Ma	-13	0	-4	13	2	30	17	1	6	-12	-2	-4	12	-14	-1	16	34	4	-25	15	-15	40	8	-12	100	40	10	-3	-3	17
26 FLF37Mb	7	38	24	31	16	-1	-2	20	-1	26	17	5	-3	-25	39	-3	6	17	20	-2	8	20	18	-6	40	100	14	-9	14	10
27 FLF37Mc	21	20	-7	20	-1	-3	2	17	5	13	8	-6	49	8	39	-12	7	32	2	4	16	-29	-4	-2	10	14	100	13	25	15
28 NCF32M	0	-1	9	24	5	-19	37	35	17	4	-5	10	4	11	5	5	-3	11	-2	23	3	-15	20	-17	-3	-9	13	100	10	24
29 FLM34D	31	44	35	30	-10	-4	-3	-8	33	45	20	55	41	17	41	-1	-1	39	9	19	-9	-9	-18	-3	-3	14	25	10	100	3
30 NCM48M	-2	2	-3	7	6	3	24	-8	0	-2	-1	-6	8	1	0	-1	4	12	15	10	-12	13	5	-26	17	10	15	24	3	100
31 FLF44D	39	13	17	27	-33	8	-3	-13	62	31	-1	30	37	59	-3	24	23	43	-14	49	-21	-4	-27	5	3	-22	6	17	39	14
32 FLM35M	47	44	41	38	-35	21	-19	15	47	54	7	36	24	29	22	15	0	31	21	43	2	7	-16	0	17	32	17	0	43	-2
33 FLM42D	44	51	35	29	-19	16	-5	10	43	58	-4	24	30	25	32	4	-9	56	28	52	2	-13	-22	1	7	16	18	10	55	29
34 FLF53M	0	0	2	39	38	-12	17	24	23	11	36	12	-18	11	13	2	21	4	7	0	3	38	32	-21	-8	39	11	14	-2	12
35 FLF56O	17	4	9	26	8	3	0	-1	25	-1	-5	17	12	8	2	8	14	-1	0	-4	-5	26	8	7	20	6	-16	-4	-6	-10
36 FLF46M	10	20	7	25	-21	-8	1	1	3	17	-10	22	8	5	11	4	31	0	-13	0	3	12	14	-38	20	9	-18	10	11	11
37 FLF39D	13	-5	4	19	21	-9	4	26	30	19	10	14	9	6	44	-13	22	27	-26	9	18	21	21	-4	23	25	9	13	17	4
38 TXF57D	-17	-14	-4	3	31	-1	28	13	0	-10	15	3	16	18	1	1	19	-2	-10	7	4	9	37	-3	-13	-21	28	8	-3	-2
39 TXF32D	20	31	35	32	5	18	2	16	10	26	16	18	-2	16	46	19	18	33	10	15	23	-13	15	7	17	37	15	1	15	5
40 GAF42M	44	10	23	25	-16	19	4	11	60	35	13	27	14	64	33	7	14	50	-3	54	-9	-4	-34	8	-9	-11	13	6	20	-12

	SORTS	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40
1	FLM47D	39	47	44	0	17	10	13	-17	20	44
2	FLM48M	13	44	51	0	4	20	-5	-14	31	10
3	FLF49D	17	41	35	2	9	7	4	-4	35	23
4	FLF36M	27	38	29	39	26	25	19	3	32	25
5	FLF29M	-33	-35	-19	38	8	-21	21	31	5	-16
6	FLF34M	8	21	16	-12	3	-8	-9	-1	18	19
7	FLF47M	-3	-19	-5	17	0	1	4	28	2	4
8	FLM38O	-13	15	10	24	-1	1	26	13	16	11
9	FLF37M	62	47	43	23	25	3	30	0	10	60
10	FLF34M	31	54	58	11	-1	17	19	-10	26	35
11	FLF39M	-1	7	-4	36	-5	-10	10	15	16	13
12	FLF33M	30	36	24	12	17	22	14	3	18	27
13	FLM49D	37	24	30	-18	12	8	9	16	-2	14
14	FLM36D	59	29	25	11	8	5	6	18	16	64
15	FLF30M	-3	22	32	13	2	11	44	1	46	33
16	NCF37M	24	15	4	2	8	4	-13	1	19	7
17	VAM34O	23	0	-9	21	14	31	22	19	18	14
18	FLM26M	43	31	56	4	-1	0	27	-2	33	50
19	VAF30M	-14	21	28	7	0	-13	-26	-10	10	-3
20	FLM39M	49	43	52	0	-4	0	9	7	15	54
21	TXF41M	-21	2	2	3	-5	3	18	4	23	-9
22	FLF42M	-4	7	-13	38	26	12	21	9	-13	-4
23	FLF50S	-27	-16	-22	32	8	14	21	37	15	-34
24	FLF32O	5	0	1	-21	7	-38	-4	-3	7	8
25	FLF37Ma	3	17	7	-8	20	20	23	-13	17	-9
26	FLF37Mb	-22	32	16	39	6	9	25	-21	37	-11
27	FLF37Mc	6	17	18	11	-16	-18	9	28	15	13
28	NCF32M	17	0	10	14	-4	10	13	8	1	6

EXAMINING PERCEPTIONS OF BLACK

176

29 FLM34D	39	43	55	-2	-6	11	17	-3	15	20
30 NCM48M	14	-2	29	12	-10	11	4	-2	5	-12
31 FLF44D	100	21	31	-4	3	1	8	-9	-5	60
32 FLM35M	21	100	60	9	20	8	11	-21	9	27
33 FLM42D	31	60	100	2	1	18	10	-5	11	32
34 FLF53M	-4	9	2	100	4	-14	22	13	25	11
35 FLF56O	3	20	1	4	100	12	15	-16	-13	9
36 FLF46M	1	8	18	-14	12	100	17	12	2	0
37 FLF39D	8	11	10	22	15	17	100	10	5	16
38 TXF57D	-9	-21	-5	13	-16	12	10	100	-6	-2
39 TXF32D	-5	9	11	25	-13	2	5	-6	100	20
40 GAF42M	60	27	32	11	9	0	16	-2	20	100

Appendix N: Unrotated Factor Matrix*Unrotated Factor Matrix*

Unrotated Factors								
SORTS	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1 FLM47D	0.7001	-0.2434	0.2058	-0.0625	0.2442	-0.0911	-0.1076	-0.0691
2 FLM48M	0.6228	-0.0358	0.4887	0.1750	0.0351	0.1366	-0.2075	0.0622
3 FLF49D	0.4670	-0.0102	-0.0116	0.2405	-0.1641	-0.2857	-0.1472	0.2878
4 FLF36M	0.5324	0.4368	-0.0138	0.1162	-0.0304	-0.1883	-0.2596	0.1543
5 FLF29M	-0.2472	0.5968	0.0035	-0.0984	-0.2221	0.0420	0.3008	0.1199
6 FLF34M	0.1258	-0.2226	-0.3024	0.2565	0.0428	0.4279	0.4272	0.3457
7 FLF47M	-0.0468	0.4620	-0.4139	-0.1220	-0.3563	-0.0223	-0.1705	0.2433
8 FLM38O	0.2077	0.2837	0.3079	-0.3467	0.2680	-0.1055	-0.0867	0.0215
9 FLF37M	0.7140	0.0385	-0.3792	-0.1086	0.1348	-0.0734	0.1234	0.0670
10 FLF34M	0.7614	-0.1004	0.2019	0.0615	-0.0385	-0.0954	0.0861	-0.0379
11 FLF39M	0.1351	0.4811	-0.2171	-0.0552	-0.1856	-0.2717	0.3765	-0.2291
12 FLF33M	0.5291	0.1857	-0.0752	-0.0963	0.1787	-0.3475	-0.0994	-0.3765
13 FLM49D	0.4786	-0.1327	-0.0577	-0.1247	-0.1547	0.4899	-0.0768	-0.1019
14 FLM36D	0.6660	-0.1206	-0.3733	-0.3873	0.1011	-0.1068	-0.0627	0.1866
15 FLF30M	0.5299	0.2948	0.4962	-0.0597	-0.0594	0.0831	0.2528	-0.1862
16 NCF37M	0.2827	-0.0976	-0.1457	-0.1279	0.5276	0.2602	-0.0851	0.3466
17 VAM34O	0.2182	0.3352	-0.3054	-0.1197	0.4316	0.3628	-0.0004	-0.1751
18 FLM26M	0.7167	-0.0765	0.0085	-0.0990	-0.0894	0.1855	0.2661	-0.1204
19 VAF30M	0.2121	0.0116	0.4694	-0.0191	-0.1740	-0.2495	-0.1306	0.3826
20 FLM39M	0.6341	-0.0546	-0.3660	-0.0662	-0.1555	0.0586	-0.0169	0.3815
21 TXF41M	0.1491	0.1640	0.5839	-0.2484	0.1772	0.2266	-0.0583	0.1003
22 FLF42M	-0.1208	0.5592	-0.4990	0.3085	0.1774	-0.2551	0.0549	-0.0022
23 FLF50S	-0.0534	0.6506	0.2684	-0.2980	0.2650	0.0938	-0.2415	0.1779
24 FLF320	0.1272	-0.3425	0.2779	-0.2827	0.3442	-0.1692	0.3118	0.1493
25 FLF37Ma	0.0603	0.2928	-0.2634	0.5117	0.2348	0.4928	0.0428	0.0499
26 FLF37Mb	0.2360	0.4813	0.3714	0.5447	0.0391	0.0290	0.1873	0.0804
27 FLF37Mc	0.2947	0.0985	0.2299	-0.2160	-0.3892	0.4409	0.1710	-0.1758
28 NCF32M	0.1680	0.2288	-0.0838	-0.3251	-0.2683	0.0310	-0.4565	0.1045

EXAMINING PERCEPTIONS OF BLACK

178

29	FLM34D	0.6056	-0.0329	0.0530	0.1675	-0.3360	-0.0819	-0.0403	-0.4095
30	NCM48M	0.0755	0.1891	-0.1299	0.1608	-0.3866	0.2731	-0.2659	0.1521
31	FLF44D	0.5728	-0.2933	-0.5059	-0.1481	-0.0167	0.0042	-0.0784	-0.1133
32	FLM35M	0.6689	-0.0711	0.0401	0.4048	0.0568	-0.1351	-0.0252	0.0421
33	FLM42D	0.7039	-0.1304	0.0708	0.2563	-0.3023	0.0377	-0.1132	0.0328
34	FLF53M	0.1483	0.6456	-0.0256	-0.0781	-0.0224	-0.2621	0.2022	0.1628
35	FLF56O	0.1291	0.1258	-0.1591	0.2265	0.4416	-0.1436	-0.0957	-0.0243
36	FLF46M	0.1702	0.1825	-0.0733	0.2324	0.2021	0.1978	-0.5775	-0.3219
37	FLF39D	0.2695	0.4436	-0.0296	-0.0278	0.1295	0.1201	0.1428	-0.3904
38	TXF57D	-0.0417	0.3292	-0.1411	-0.5405	-0.1452	0.2251	-0.0387	-0.0390
39	TXF32D	0.3773	0.2707	0.2613	0.0637	0.0545	0.1122	0.2793	0.2869
40	GAF42M	0.6193	-0.1574	-0.3376	-0.2183	-0.0088	-0.1658	0.2745	-0.0150
<hr/>									
Eigenvalues		7.4726	3.7522	3.2569	2.3567	2.1557	2.0348	1.8840	1.7345
% expl.Var.		19	9	8	6	5	5	5	4
<hr/>									

REFERENCES

- Addams, H., & J. Proops, (2001). *Social discourse and environmental policy: an application of Q methodology*. Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar.
- Aguiler, J. L. (1981). Insider research: An ethnography of a debate. In D. A. Messerschmidt (Ed.), *Anthropologists at home in North America* (pp. 15-26). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Aleman, E. (2009). LatCrit educational leadership and advocacy: Struggling over Whiteness as property in Texas school finance. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 42(2), 183–201.
- Allen, W. R., Epps, E. G., Guillory, E. A., Suh, S. A., & Bonous-Hammarth, M. (2000). The black academic: Faculty status among African Americans in U.S. higher education. *The Journal of Negro Education*, 69(1/2), 112–127.
- American Council on Education. (1992). *American universities and colleges* (14th ed.). New York, NY: Walter de Gruyter.
- Bell, D. (1980). *Brown v. Board of Education* and the interest-convergence dilemma. *Harvard Law Review*, 93(3), 518-533.
- Bell, D. (1992). *Faces at the bottom of the well: The permanence of racism*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Bell, L. A. (2003). Telling tales: What stories can teach us about racism. *Race, Ethnicity, and Education*, 6, 3-28.
- Bennefield, R. M. (1999). Trench warriors: On the front lines. *Black Issues in Higher Education*, 16, 69-71.

- Bonilla-Silva, E. (2014). *Racism without racists: Color-blind racism and the persistence of racial inequality in the United States*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.
- Boyd, W. M., II. (1979). *Today's Black students: A success story* (Research Report No. 21). Washington, DC: Association of Governing Boards.
- Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka*, 347 U.S. 483 (1954)
- Brown, S. R. (1980). *Political subjectivity: Applications of Q methodology in political science*. New Haven, CT: Yale University.
- Brown, S. R. (1993). A primer on Q methodology. *Operant Subjectivity*, 16(3/4), 91-138.
- Brown, S.R. (1996). Q methodology and qualitative research. *Qualitative Health Research*, 6, 561-567.
- Brown, S.R. (2006). A match made in heaven: A marginalized methodology for studying the marginalized. *Quality & Quantity*, 40, 361-382. doi:10.1007/s11135-005-8828-2
- Burkard, A. W., Cole, D. C., Ott, M., & Stoflet, T. (2005). Entry-level competencies of new student affairs professionals: A Delphi study. *NASPA Journal*, 42(3), 283-306.
- Burke, B., Cropper, A., & Harrison, P. (2000). Real or imagined - Black women's experiences in the academy. *Community, Work, and Family*, 3(3), 297-310.
- Cabrera, A., Nora, A., Pascarella, E. T., Terenzini, P. T., & Hagedorn, L. (1999). Campus racial climate and the adjustment of students to college: A comparison between White students and African-American students. *Journal of Higher Education*, 70, 134-160.
- Caplow, T., & McGee, R. (1965). *The Academic Marketplace*. Garden City, NY: Anchor Books.

- Carbado, D.W. & Gulati, M. (2003). The law and economics of critical race theory. *Yale Law Review*, 112, 1757-1828.
- Chesler, M., Lewis, A., & Crowfoot, J. (2005). *Challenging Racism in Higher Education*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Coleman, J. L. (2002). *Perceptions of African American female student affairs administrators regarding barriers to career advancement at four-year Alabama colleges*. (Doctoral dissertation). The University of Alabama, Birmingham, AL. Retrieved August 30, 2015, from Dissertations and Theses: Full Text database. (Publication No. AAT3075116)
- Crawford, K., & Smith, D. (2005). The we and the us: Mentoring African American women. *Journal of Black Studies*, 36(1), 52-67.
- Cross, T., & Slater, R. B. (2000). The alarming decline in the academic performance of African American men. *The Journal of Blacks in Higher Education*, 27, 82-87.
- Crowl, T. K. (1993). *Fundamentals of Educational Research*. Madison, WI: Brown & Benchmark.
- Culp, J. M. (2000). Autobiography and legal scholarship and teaching: Finding the me in the legal academy. In R. Delgado & J. Stefancic (Eds.), *Critical Race Theory: The Cutting Edge* (2nd ed., pp. 487-498). Philadelphia, PA: Temple University.
- Davis, D. J. (2005). *The Summer Research Opportunity Program (SROP): Mentorship and the socialization of underrepresented racial minorities into the professoriate*. Ann Arbor, MI: ProQuest Information and Learning.

- Davis, P. C. (2000). Law as microaggression. In R. Delgado & J. Stefancic. (Eds.), *Critical Race Theory: The Cutting Edge* (2nd ed., pp.141-151). Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- DeCuir, J.T., & Dixon, A. (2004). "So when it comes out, they aren't that surprised that it is there": Using critical race theory as a tool of analysis of race and racism in education. *Educational Researcher*, 33(5), 26-31.
- Dei, G. J. S., Karumanchery, L. L., & Karumanchery-Luik, N. (2007). *Playing the Race Card: Exposing White power and Privilege*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Delgado, R. (1984). The imperial scholar: Reflections on a review of civil rights literature. *University of Pennsylvania Law Review*, 132, 561-578.
- Delgado, R. (1989). Storytelling for oppositionists and others: A plea for narrative. *Michigan Law Review*, 87(8), 2411-441.
- Delgado, R. (1995). *Critical Race Theory*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Delgado, R., & Stefancic, J. (2001). *Critical Race Theory: An Introduction*. New York, NY: New York University Press.
- DeLyser, D. (2001). "Do you really live here?" Thoughts on insider research. *Geographical Review*, 91(1/2), 441-453.
- Dixon, A. D. & Rousseau, C. K. (2005). Toward a Critical Race Theory of Education. In A. D. Dixon & C. K. Rousseau (Eds.), *Critical Race Theory in Education: All God's Children Got a Song* (pp. 11-30). New York, NY: Routledge.
- England, K. V. L. (1994). Getting personal: Reflexivity, positionality, and feminist research. *The Professional Geographer*, 46(1), 80-89.

- Feagin, J. R. (1991). The continuing significance of race: Anti-Black discrimination in public places. *American Sociological Review*, (56), 101-116.
- Feagin, J. R. (2006). *Systemic Racism: A Theory of Oppression*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Freeman, D. (2011). Teaching Obama: history, critical race theory and social work education. *Patterns Of Prejudice*, 45(1/2), 177-197.
- Fey, C. J. (1991). *Mid-level student affairs administrators: A study of management skills and professional development needs* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Texas A&M University, College Station, TX.
- Flick, U. (2002). *Qualitative Research in Psychology: A Textbook*. London, England: Sage.
- Fontana, A., & Frey, J.H. (2005). The interview: From neutral stance to political involvement. In Denzin, N.K., & Lincoln, Y.S. (eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research* (3rd ed., pp. 695-728). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Fox, H. (2001). *When Race Breaks Out: Conversations about Race and Racism in College Classrooms*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Franklin, J. H., & A. A. Moss, Jr. (1988). *From Slavery to Freedom: A History of Negro Americans* (6th ed.). New York, NY: Random House.
- Gruber, J. E. (1980). Sources of satisfaction among students in postsecondary education. *American Journal of Education*, 88, 320-344.
- Guillory, R. M. (2001). *Strategies for Overcoming Barriers of Being an African American Administrator on a Predominantly White Campus*. Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing.
- Harper, S. R. (2012). Race without racism: How higher education researchers minimize racist institutional norms. *The Review of Higher Education*, 36(1), 9-29.

- Harvey, W.B. (1999). *Grass Roots and Glass Ceilings*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Herbrand, L. (2001). *Career paths of senior student affairs officers in American four-year institutions of higher education* (Doctoral dissertation). Ball State University, Muncie, IN.
- Holmes, S. (2003) Black female administrators speak out: Narratives on race and gender in higher education. *National Association of Student Affairs Professionals Journal*, 6(1), 45-66.
- Gonzalez, K. P. (2003). Campus culture and the experiences of Chicano students in a predominantly White university. *Urban Education*, 37(2), 193-218.
- Grassmuck, K. (1991). Throughout the 80s, colleges hired more non-teaching staff than other employees. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, A22.
- Jackson, J. F. (2001). A new test for diversity: Retaining African American administrators at predominantly White institutions. In L. Jones (Ed.), *Retaining African Americans in Higher Education: Challenging Paradigms for Retaining Students, Faculty, and Administrators* (pp. 93-109). Sterling, VA: Stylus Publishing.
- Jackson, J. F. (2004). Engaging, retaining, and advancing African Americans in executive level positions: A descriptive and trend analysis of academic administrators in higher and postsecondary education. *Journal of Negro Education*, 73(1), 4-20.
- Jackson, J. F., & O'Callaghan, E. (2009a). Special Issue: Ethnic and racial administrative diversity: Understanding work life realities and experiences in higher education. *ASHE Higher Education Report*, 35(3), 1-95. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

- Jackson, J. F., O'Callaghan, E. (2009b). Factors influencing engagement, retention and advancement for administrators of color. *ASHE Higher Education Report* 35(3), 47-64.
- Jackson, K. (1991). Black faculty in academia. In P. Altbach & K. Lomotey (Eds.), *The Racial Crisis in American Higher Education* (pp. 135–148). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Johnsrud, L. K. (1996). *Maintaining Morale: A Guide to Assessing the Morale of Midlevel Administrators and Faculty*. Washington, DC: College and University Personnel Association.
- Johnsrud, L. K., Heck, R. H., & Rosser, V. J. (2000). Morale matters: Midlevel administrators and their intent to leave. *Journal of Higher Education*, 71(1), 34- 59.
- Johnsrud, L. K., & Rosser, V. J. (1999). College and university midlevel administrators: Explaining and improving their morale. *Review of Higher Education*, 22(2), 121-141.
- Joiner, O. H., Bonner, J. C., Shearouse, H. S., & Smith, T. E. (1979). *A History of Public Education in Georgia, 1734-1976*. Columbia, SC: R.L. Bryan.
- Kane, N. E. (1982). *A comparative study of student affairs mid-level professionals: Characteristics, perceived skill attainment and need for continued development* (Doctoral dissertation). Florida State University, Tallahassee, FL. Available from Dissertation Abstracts International, 43(09), 2902A.
- Kanter, R. M. (1977). *Men and Women of the Corporation*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Kanter, R. M. (1993). *Men and Women of the Corporation* (2nd Ed.). New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Kaplin, W. A., & Lee, B. A. (1995). *The law of higher education* (3rd Ed.). San Francisco:

Jossey-Bass.

Kennedy, R. (1989). Racial critiques of legal academia. *Harvard Law Review*, 102, 1745-1819.

King, K. L., & Watts, I. E. (2004). Assertiveness or the drive to succeed? Surviving at a predominantly White university. In D. Cleveland (Ed.), *A Long Way to Go: Conversations About Race by African American Faculty and Graduate Students*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Kline, P. (1994). *An Easy Guide to Factor Analysis*. New York: Routledge.

Konrad, A. & Pfeffer, J. (1991). Understanding the hiring of women and minorities in educational institutions. *Sociology of Education*, 64, 141-157.

Kraus, J., Jr. (1983). Middle management in higher education: A dog's life? *Journal of the College and University Personnel Association*, 34(4), 29-35.

Ladson-Billings, G. (1998). Just what is critical race theory and what's it doing in a nice field like education? *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, 11(1), 7-24.

Ladson- Billings, G. (2000). Racialized discourses and ethnic epistemologies. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds), *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Ladson-Billings, G., & Donner, J. (2005). The moral activist role of critical race theory scholarship. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of Qualitative Research* (3rd ed., pp. 279–301). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Ladson-Billings, G., & Tate, W. F. (1995). Toward a critical race theory of education. *Teachers College Record*, 97(1), 47-68.

- Ladson-Billings, G., & Tate, W. F. (2006). Toward a critical race theory of education. In A. D. Dixson & C. K. Rousseau (Eds.), *Critical Race Theory in Education: All God's Children Got a Song* (pp. 11-30). New York, NY: Taylor and Francis.
- Lemoine, J. A. (1985). Professional development for mid-level student affairs professionals at the small college (North Central Region). (Doctoral dissertation). Indiana University, Bloomington IN). Available from Dissertation Abstracts International, 46(10), 2878A.
- Lewis, A. E., Chesler, M., & Forman, T. A. (2000). The impact of "colorblind" ideologies on students of color: Intergroup relations at a predominantly White university. *The Journal of Negro Education*, 69(1/2), 74-91.
- Lindsay, B. (1997). Toward conceptual, policy and programmatic frameworks of affirmative action in South African universities. *Journal of Negro Education*, 66(4)
- Lopez, G. (2003). The (racially neutral) politics of education: A critical race theory perspective. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 39(1), 68-94.
- Loxley, A., & Seery, A. (2008). Some philosophical and other related issues in insider research. In P. Sikes & A. Potts (Eds.), *Researching Education from the Inside: Investigations from Within* (pp. 15-32). London, England: Routledge.
- Lunsford, L. W. (1984). Chief student affairs officer: The ladder to the top. *NASPA Journal*, 22(1), 48-56.
- Lynn, M., & Adams, M. (2002). Introductory overview to the special issue critical race theory and education: Recent developments in the field. *Equity & Excellence in Education*, 35(2), 87-92.

- Maguire, L.A., & Steelman, T.A. (1999). Understanding participant perspectives: Q Methodology in national forest management. *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 18(3), 361-388.
- Matsuda, M. J. (1987). Looking to the bottom: Critical legal studies and reparations. *Harvard Civil Rights - Civil Liberties Law Review* 22, 323-400.
- Matsuda, M. J. (1991). Voices of America: Accent, antidiscrimination law, and a jurisprudence for the last reconstruction. *Yale Law Journal*, 100, 1329-1407.
- Matsuda, M. J., Lawrence, C. R., Delgado, R., & Crenshaw, K. W. (1993). *Words that wound: Critical race theory, assaultive speech, and the First Amendment*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Matthews, D. E., & Ross, E. (1975). Observations from the placement front: Insensitivity and racism are not dead. *Journal of Non-White Concerns in Personnel and Guidance*, (3), 100-103.
- McDowell, L. (1992) Multiple voices: Speaking from inside and outside “the project.” *Antipode* 24: 56-72.
- McKeown, B., & Thomas, D. (1988). *Q methodology*. Sage University Paper series on *Quantitative Applications in the Social Sciences*, 07-066. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Menges, R. J. & Exum, W. H. (1983). Barriers to the progress of women and minority faculty. *Journal of Higher Education*, 54:123-144.
- Merriam, S.B., & Associates (2002). Case study, *Qualitative research in practice: Examples for discussion and analysis* (pp.178-180). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

- Merton, R. K. (1972). Insiders and outsiders: A chapter in the sociology of knowledge. *American Journal of Sociology*, 78(1), 9-47.
- Meyers, J. (1997). Why diversity is a smoke screen for affirmative action. *Change*, 24-32.
- Mills, D. B. (1993). The role of the middle manager. In M. J. Barr and Associates (Eds.), *The Handbook of Student Affairs Administration* (pp. 121-134). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Mills, D. B. (2000). The role of the middle manager. In M. Barr & M. Desler, (Eds.), *The Handbook of Student Affairs Administration* (pp. 135-153). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Milner, H. R. (2008). Critical race theory and interest convergence as analytic tools in teacher education policies and practices. *Journal of Teacher Education*, 59(4), 332-346.
- Moses, Y. T. (1997). Black women in academe: Issues and strategies. In L. Benjamin, (Ed.), *Black Women in the Academy: Promises and Perils* (pp. 23-37). Gainesville, FL: University Press of Florida
- Naples, N. A. (2003). *Feminism and Method: Ethnography, Discourse Analysis, and Activist Research*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2016). Digest of Education Statistics (*Institutional Characteristics Survey (IPEDS-IC:90-99), and Fall 2001 through Fall 2013*). Washington D.C.: U.S. Department of Education.
- Newman, I., & Ramlo, S. (2010). Using Q methodology and Q factor analysis in mixed methods research. In A. Tashakkori & C. Teddlie (Eds.), *SAGE Handbook of Mixed Methods in Social and Behavioral Research* (pp. 505-530). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage

Publications.

O' Brien, M. (1999). Discriminatory effects: Desegregation litigation in higher education in Georgia. *William and Mary Bill of Rights Journal*, 8(1), 1-48.

Parker, L., & Lynn, M. (2002). What's race got to do with it? CRT's conflicts with and connections to qualitative research methodology and epistemology. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 8(1), 7-22.

Patitu, C. L., & Hinton, K. G. (2003). The experiences of African American women faculty and administrators in higher education: Has anything changed? *New Directions for Student Services*, 2003(104), 79-93.

Patton, M. (1990). *Qualitative Evaluation and Research Methods*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Patton, M. (2002). *Qualitative Research and Evaluation Methods* (3rd ed.) Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Patton, L., McEwen, M., Rendón, L., & Howard-Hamilton, M. (2007). Critical race perspectives on theory in student affairs. *New Directions for Student Services*, 2007(120), 39-53.

Penn, J. R. (1990). Mid-management role issues: Expectations, conflicts, and ambiguities. In R. B. Young (Ed.), *The Invisible Leaders: Student Affairs Midmanagers* (pp. 40-55). Washington, DC: National Association of Student Personnel Administrators.

Peritore, P.N. (1989). Brazilian party left opinion: a Q methodology profile. *Political Psychology*, 10, 675-702.

- Phelps, D. G. and Taber, L. S. (1996), Affirmative action as an equal opportunity opportunity. *New Directions for Community Colleges*, 1996: 67–79. doi:10.1002/cc.36819969409
- Reichert, C. (1994). The art of mentoring. *The Toastmaster*. 60:11, 8-11
- Rhoades, G., & Slaughter, S. (1997). Academic capitalism, managed professionals, and supply-side higher education. *Social Text*, 51, 9-38.
- Rickard, S. T. (1985). Career pathways of chief student affairs officers: Making room at the top for females and minorities. *NASPA Journal*, 22(4), 52-60.
- Roberts, D. M. (2003). *Skill development among student affairs professionals in the National Association of Student Personnel Administrators Region III* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Texas A&M University, College Station, TX.
- Rolle, K. A. (1998). *The experiences of African American administrators in predominately white institutions* (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation). Colorado State University, Fort Collins, CO.
- Rolle, K. A., Davies, T. G., & Banning, J.H. (2000). African American administrators' experiences in predominantly white colleges and universities. *Community College Journal of Research and Practice*, 24, 79-94.
- Rosser, V. J. (2000). Midlevel administrators: What we know. In L. K. Johnsrud & V. J. Rosser (Eds.) *Understanding the work and career paths of midlevel administrators*, New Directions for Higher Education Series No. 111, 28(3), (pp. 5-13). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Rosser, V. J. (2004). A national study on midlevel leaders in higher education: The unsung professionals in the academy. *Higher Education*, 48, 317-337.

- Rosser, V. J., & Javinar, J. M. (2003). Midlevel student affairs leaders' intentions to leave: Examining the quality of their professional and institutional work life. *Journal of College Student Development*, 44, 813-830.
- Sagaria, M. D. (2002). An exploratory model of filtering in administrative searches: Toward counter hegemonic discourses, *Journal of higher education*, 73(6), 677-710.
- Sagaria, M. A. & Johnsrud, L. K. (1988). Mobility within the student affairs profession: Career advancement through position change. *Journal of College Student Development*, 29(1), 30-40.
- Schmolck, P., & Atkinson, J. (2014). PQMethod [Software]. Published instrument. Retrieved from <http://schmolck.userweb.mwn.de/qmethod/#PQMethod>.
- Scott, R. A. (1975). Middle management on campus: Training ground or wasteland. *Journal of the National Association of College Admissions Counselors*, 20(1), 38-40.
- Scott, R. A. (1980). Lords, squires, and yeomen: Collegiate middle-managers in the U.S. *Higher Education*, 9, 385-398.
- Smith, R. R. (1998). *Factors that hinder and promote women administrators' career advancement in higher education* (Doctoral dissertation). University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA. (UMI No. 9931861).
- Smith, W. A. (2010). Toward an understanding of misandric microaggressions and racial battle fatigue among African Americans in historically White institutions. In E. M. Zamani-Gallaher & V. C. Polite (Eds.), *The state of the African American male* (pp. 265-277). East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University Press. Published, 03/14/2010.

- Smith, W. A., Yosso, T. J., & Solorzano, D. G. (2007). Racial primes and black misandry on historically white campuses: Toward critical race accountability in educational administration. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 43(5), 559-585.
- Solórzano, D., & Delgado Bernal, D. (2001). Examining transformational resistance through critical race theory and Latcrit theory framework; Chicana and Chicano students in an urban context. *Urban Education*, 36(3), 308-342.
- Solórzano, D., Ceja, M., & Yosso, T. (2000). Critical race theory, racial microaggressions, and campus racial climate: The experiences of African American college students. *Journal of Negro Education*, 69(1/2), 60.
- Solórzano, D. G., & Yosso, T. J. (2001). Critical race and LatCrit theory and method: Counter-storytelling [Electronic version]. *Qualitative Studies in Education*, 14, 471-495.
- Sue, D. W. (2003). *Overcoming our racism: The journey to liberation*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass
- Sue, D. W. (2010). Microaggressions, marginality and oppression: An introduction. In D.W. Sue (Ed.), *Microaggressions and Marginality: Manifestation, Dynamics, and Impact* (pp. 3-22). Hoboken, New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons.
- Tate, W. F. (1997). Critical race theory and education: History, theory and implications. In M.Apple (Ed.), *Review of Research in Education* (pp. 195-250), vol. 22. Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.
- Valverde, L. A. (2003). *Leaders of Color in Higher Education: Unrecognized Triumphs in Harsh Institutions*. Walnut Creek, CA: Alta Mira Press.

- Vroom, V. (1964). *Work and motivation*. New York, NY: Wiley.
- Washington, V., & Harvey, W. B. (1989). *Affirmative Rhetoric, Negative Action: African-American and Hispanic Faculty at Predominantly White Institutions*. Washington, D.C.: School of Education and Human Development, George Washington University.
- Watts, S., & Stenner, P. (2012). *Doing Q Methodological Research, Theory, Method and Interpretation*. London, England: Sage.
- Weis, L., & Fine, M. (2000). *Speed Bumps: A Student Friendly Guide to Qualitative Research*. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.
- Weitz, R., & Gordon, L. (1993). Images of Black women among Anglo college students. *Sex Roles*, 28(1-2), 19-34.
- Wilder, J. (2015) *Color Stories: Black Women and Colorism in the 21st Century*. Santa Barbara: ABC-CLIO.
- Williams, A. (1989). Research on Black women college administrators: Descriptive and interview data. *Sex Roles*, 21(1/2), 99-112.
- Wilson, R. (1989). Women of color in academic administration: Trends, progress, and barriers. *Sex Roles: A Journal of Research* 21:85-97.
- Winston, Jr., R. B., & Creamer, D. G. (1997). *Improving staffing practices in student affairs*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Yosso, T. J. (2006). *Critical Race Counterstories along the Chicana/Chicano Educational Pipeline*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Young, R. B. (1990). *The Invisible Leaders: Student Affairs Mid-Managers*. Washington, DC: National Association of Student Personnel Administrators.

- Young, R. B. (2007). Still leaders? Still invisible? In R. L. Ackerman (Ed.), *The Midlevel Manager in Student Affairs: Strategies for Success* (pp. 255-274). Washington, DC: National Association of Student Personnel Administrators.
- Zamani, E. M. (2003). African American women in higher education [Special Issue: Meeting the needs of African American women]. *New Directions for Student Services*, 2003(104), 5–18. doi: 10.1002/ss.103
- Zamudio, M. M., Russell, C., Rios, F. A., & Bridgeman, J. L. (2011). *Critical Race Theory Matters: Education and Ideology*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Zuberi, T., & Bonilla-Silva, E. (2008). *White logic, white methods: Racism and methodology*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.